Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XVI, No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1927.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
In Memoriam	605
Reunion and Reaction	606
Women Preachers in Anglican Pulpits	608
The Need for a Modernist Clergy	609
A Free Church Modernist Conference	611
Christianity in the Public Schools	613
Mr. Arnold Lunn and Disestablishment	616
The Significance of the Fourth Gospel J. S. Bezzant, M.A.	618
The New Cathedral C. E. Raven, D.D.	632
The Older Orthodoxy E. C. Bayliss, M.A.	639
Book Reviews:	
From a Victorian Post Bag	646
The Migration of Symbols	648
Anglo-Catholicism	649
God and the Machine	651
Church Music	652
St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem	653
Christian Education	655
Correspondence	655

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: South Africa—T. Maskew Miller, Cape Town.
Australasia—Geo. Hicks, 54 Victoria Street, Wellington.
United States—Arthur Brentano, New York.

Price 1/- net. (Annual Subscription, 10/6.)

Cadbury means Quality

Two Popular Hotels in Central London.

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, LONDON, W.C.1.

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, LONDON, W.C.1.

FIRST CLASS TEMPERANCE HOTELS.

200 Rooms in each Hotel. Modern Arrangements.

REFINEMENT. ECONOMY.

Electric Radiators in all Bedrooms.

Bedroom, Breakfast and Attendance, from 8s. 6d. per night.

Illustrated Booklet on Application.

Telegrams:—

THACKERAY HOTEL: **'Thackeray, London.'** KINGSLEY HOTEL: **'Bookcraft, London.'**

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by Bishop Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919.)

Warden: The Right Rev. T. B. STRONG, D.D., Mus.D., D.Litt., G.B.E., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal: Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., D.D.

Vice-Principal: Rev. J. S. BEZZANT, M.A.

Tutor: Rev. F. L. CROSS, M.A., B.Sc.

RIPON HALL is a Graduate Theological College designed to afford a training on modern lines to candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Full particulars of the Course, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic, and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 11. FEBRUARY, 1927. Vol. XVI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

In Memoriam.

By the death of Canon T. L. Papillon and Canon F. D. Cremer, the Modernist Movement in the English Church has lost two staunch supporters whose services extended over a quarter of a century.

Thomas Leslie Papillon, Fellow of Merton (1865—70) and Fellow of New College (1870—84), was a brilliant classical scholar, a member of the Mosely Educational Commission to U.S.A., and an authority on Campanology. He was Whitehall Preacher, 1877—79. Besides being an Oxford examiner, he also examined for Sandhurst, Woolwich, the Civil Service, and the newer Universities. After retiring from Oxford, he became a devoted country clergyman: it was at this stage that he developed his great interest in bells and bell-ringing, and contributed articles on the subject to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

For eighteen years (1903—21) he sat on the Council of the Churchmen's Union and rarely missed a meeting. From 1909 to 1914 he was Chairman of the Council and is gratefully remembered, as the minute expressing regret at his resignation records, 'for his invariably able and courteous conduct in the chair.' He was Vice-President from 1915 to 1927. In 1916, he founded the Herts Branch, and, in the Union's earlier days especially, he did a considerable amount of writing, preaching, and public speaking on its behalf. He attended the first Modern Churchmen's Conference at Ripon in July, 1914. His support of our cause was characterised by a certain steady energy and an un-

failing 'sweet reasonableness.' He was one of those rare types whose absence is felt even more vividly than their presence.

Frederick Daustini Cremer, as a hard-working parish priest, first in Yorkshire and Lancashire and then in the South of England, did all in his power to promote those ideals of truth, freedom and comprehensiveness within the English Church, by which he believed that she can alone realize her true vocation as the Church of the English people. When Vicar of Eccles, Canon Cremer founded the Manchester Branch of the Churchmen's Union. He was a member of the Council and Vice-President for many years, a regular attendant at the Modern Churchmen's Conferences and a frequent speaker. Frank, buoyant, energetic, and fearless, he was never afraid either of experiment or criticism. He cultivated relationships with the Free Churches by co-operative social endeavour, interchange of pulpits, and united services of prayer and Communion, when such things were regarded as 'profane novelties' by the more rigid Church folk. Although nearly eighty years of age, he was present at our last Girton Conference as cheerful, interested and optimistic as ever. He passed hence in characteristic fashion. Returning from taking Sunday duty, he hastened to catch a 'bus in order to attend a clerical conference, when his heart failed. A large circle of friends will miss him greatly, but none will mourn for him.

As we think with gratitude of those who, in the uncertain issues of the early days of our movement, served it so well, we are reminded of an incident in the life of Mohammed. One of his later wives asked him if he did not love her more than he loved Ayesha. 'By Allah! No!' cried the Prophet, 'Ayesha believed in me when no one else did.'

Reunion and Reaction.

On January 20 a representative gathering of the English Church Union, presided over by Lord Shaftesbury, carried with but one dissentient the following resolution:

> That this meeting of the E.C.U. records its belief that the admission to the pulpits of the Church, and especially of the cathedrals, of Nonconformist and other unlicensed preachers is contrary to Church order and justly gives offence to Church people. It therefore calls upon members of the Union to use their influence to counteract this evil in every legitimate manner that lies in their power.

Judged by the standard of traditional practice the E.C.U. has right on its side. Those who are not in communion with the Church as traditionally conceived have no right, while in this separated state, to be admitted to teach the faithful. When Fr. Waggett maintained that as the altar is sacred so is the pulpit, and that they who are not lawfully admitted to the one may not lawfully be admitted to the other, his logic, based on historic precedent, is irrefragable.

The English Church, however, is not bound by the tradition of the past. It is a living Church facing not backward but forward : its authority is not ecclesiastical precedent, but the Holy Spirit directing it in the light of Christ's teaching and example how best to advance the Kingdom of God on earth. Under the influence of these considerations the Lambeth Conference of 1920 passed resolutions in favour of such practices as the E.C.U. resolution condemns.

The E.C.U. answer, when this is urged, is that the Lambeth resolutions in this matter have been nullified by the Free Church rejection of the Lambeth proposals for reunion. If after that rejection Free Churchmen are invited by the Anglican authorities to preach in Anglican pulpits, reunion is not thereby promoted, but schism is condoned. Here again we are compelled to disagree. The real basis for reunion with Free Churchmen must be found in the preliminary establishment of cordial relations. Where there is a large measure of Christian faith and practice common to both parties such cordial relations are best established by public co-operation in Christian service for the nation, and by personal intercourse on all available occasions. St. Ambrose declared that it had not pleased God to save His people by dialectic, and the idea that theological controversy or even ecclesiastical diplomacy can do it is discredited at the bar of history. So far as our experience goes, God saves His people by the operation of Divine love transmitted through human personalities. If personalities of this kind, representing the Free Churches, address congregations from Anglican pulpits, it is bound to have good results towards the uniting of English-speaking Christendom. The adhesion to traditional Catholic practice, which the E.C.U. advocates, is utterly futile and can serve no other end than to harden our unhappy divisions and in-

crease our weakness in the presence of opposing forces. When the success of Christian Missions abroad depends in no small measure upon the securing of Christian peace at home, the passing of such a resolution by the E.C.U. can only be regarded as deplorable. If we thought it really represented the spirit of the English Church, we should despair of the English Church. We know, however, that it represents something which is slowly but surely being eliminated from the English Church. Whether, when eliminated, it will seek the *limina Petri*, whence it came forth, we are not concerned more particularly to enquire.

Women Preachers in Anglican Pulpits.

The Bishop of Birmingham having received a letter from the local secretary of the E.C.U. containing the above resolution, combined with a protest against the invitation given to women to occupy Anglican pulpits, as at Liverpool last July, and more recently in the parish church of Birmingham, sent the following reply :

> I would, in the first place, draw attention to a resolution passed at the Lambeth Conference of 1920. It runs as follows : 'In view of prospects and projects of Reunion . . . a Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who, in his judgment, are working towards the ideal of union such as is described in our appeal, to preach in churches within his diocese.'
>
> The Lambeth Conference of 1920 was attended by more than 250 Bishops of the Anglican Communion. It was the most impressive gathering of Bishops in the history of our Church. Its deliberations on the question of Reunion were long and thorough. Its resolutions were most carefully drafted. The Church of England is an episcopal communion, and that any body of men within it should challenge a decision so reached and not appear to themselves thereby to repudiate the principles of episcopal government will cause surprise to all those who may be aware of the facts.
>
> I would further point out that the foregoing resolution is not confined to ministers who are men. In some Christian communions, as, for example, in that branch of the Church Universal known as the Salvation Army, women equally with men are ministers. I do not see how, without repudiating the authority of the Lambeth Conference, it is possible that objection could be taken were representative women such as Mrs. Bramwell Booth or Miss Royden to preach in Anglican churches with the permission of the bishop. Such invitations to women to preach in the parish church of Birmingham, as have recently been issued with my cordial approval, are justified by another resolution of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. One of the most impressive portions of the Encyclical Letter issued by the Conference was that which dealt with the ministry of women. It was therein said :—
>
> 'We feel bound to respect the customs of the Church, not as an

iron law, but as results and records of the Spirit's guidance. In such customs there is much which obviously was dictated by reasonable regard to contemporary social conventions. As these differ from age to age, and country to country, the use which the Church makes of the service of women will also differ.'

In such words I discern a wise understanding of the need of progressive development and an opposition to the inertia which shelters behind such a phrase as 'the order and discipline of the Catholic Church.' In accordance with the general principle which it affirmed, the Lambeth Conference resolved that opportunity should be given to women as to men, duly qualified and approved by the Bishop, to speak in consecrated or unconsecrated buildings and to lead in prayer at other than the regular and appointed services of the Church.

At the parish church of Birmingham women duly qualified and approved by myself have spoken at the series of exceptional mid-week services arranged by the Rector. Large congregations have assembled to hear them. They have used their especial gifts for the spiritual welfare of the city. No cause of offence has been given by their ministry. I conceive that I should be hindering the spread of true religion were I to prohibit such invitations as the Rector has issued. Neither in this matter nor as regards sermons by Free Church ministers from the pulpits of our churches am I prepared to repudiate the Lambeth resolutions. The cause of Christian reunion I have deeply at heart. I earnestly desire that the Church shall make the fullest possible use of the religious gifts of educated women. For these reasons I must return a decisive negative to the requests implicit in the resolutions which you have sent to me.

We observed in a French Protestant newspaper the following comment at the time of the appointment of Dr. Barnes to the See of Birmingham:

'It seems not improbable that the issues between Modernism and Traditionalism in the English Church will be decided in Birmingham.'

We attached little importance to this remark at the time, but a succession of events has since led us to wonder whether the writer was not endowed with the prophetic spirit. If it should turn out to be so, it will be because our Traditionalists have taken every opportunity of putting it to the test.

The Need for a Modernist Clergy.

The Anglo-Catholics are appealing for £75,000 to be spent on the training of Anglo-Catholic ordinands; the Evangelicals for £50,000 to be spent on the training of Evangelical ordinands. The *Church Times* informs its readers that:

The Church of England must now do what the Roman Church and the dissenting sects have always had to do. It must pay for the training of its ministers, and if those ministers are to include a large proportion of Catholic-minded priests, then the Catholic laity must put its hand deep into its pocket.

The question naturally arises whether Modern Churchmen either as individuals or through their parochial organizations ought not to be making similar efforts. If it be true that Catholic and Evangelical ordinands need financial assistance, it is hardly less true of Modernists. Modernist clergymen must often come across able young men with a vocation to Holy Orders who cannot possibly graduate and pass their Deacon's examination without financial assistance. If these men accept financial assistance from other sources and are sent to traditionalist theological colleges, they are apt to abandon the thought of ordination altogether. The formation of a Modernist Ordinands' Society, to which Modernist clergy could refer promising ordinands for assistance, is highly desirable. It lies with our Modernist laity to form it. A definitely Modernist Theological College like Ripon Hall receives many applications from Modernist clergymen and laymen asking whether its students cannot accept a title in their parish. It is often quite impossible, on account of limited numbers, to accept the invitation. It does not occur to those making the request to perceive the need for such an effort and organization as we have suggested, which would enable Modernists in combination to secure the ordinands they need and to assist their training. It is of no use to-day for Modernists to complain about the large numbers of non-graduates who are being ordained, and the unsatisfactory character of their Church ideals, unless they have themselves striven to provide a Modernist ministry. Certainly there is a growing need for Modernist clergy, and that for no sectarian purpose. We need them to unify and simplify our Church life. We need them most of all because our national life needs them. An increasing number of our young men and women of all classes are ceasing to live as practising Christians.

The religious situation to-day among the educated English laity is marked by a deepening cleavage, whereby they are slowly but surely being split into two groups. One, the smaller group, formed of religious fanatics, rigid in their practice and obscurantist in their beliefs; the other, a much larger group consisting of a mixed multitude of non-practising Churchmen some Christian, some Agnostic, some hedonist, some secularist who decline to take any part in organized institutional religion

The English clergy, who ought firmly to stand as arbiters between these two groups, and proclaim and practise an ideal at once Christian, intelligible, moral and practical, seem in increasing numbers to be throwing themselves more and more into the arms of the fanatics. This process, unless it can be checked, threatens to end in the nation being lost to the Church. What is needed is, by incessant and many-sided endeavour, to secure a growing support for that ideal which was the aim of the great Archbishop Tillotson :

> 'To bring into fashion again that plain and unaffected piety, free from the extremes both of superstition and enthusiasm, which flourished in the age of our immediate forefathers.'

This can only be done by paying increasing attention to religious education and above all to the training of the clergy. Unless real success can be achieved here that disaster will overtake us which has befallen Christianity among the Latin races, where a wretchedly educated priesthood ministers to a practising laity which constitutes but a small proportion of the entire population of the country.

A Free Church Modernist Conference.

We are glad to learn that a Modernist Conference to examine the Christian Faith in the light of modern science and criticism will meet at Mansfield College, Oxford, from July 11th to 16th, 1927. Owing to the difficulties of accommodation the Conference is limited to one hundred and fifty ministers and thirty specially invited laymen and women of the Congregationalist Church.

The document announcing the Conference explains its origin, purpose, and scope as follows :—

> In the *Congregational Quarterly* of April, 1926, Dr. Horton suggested a Conference which would attempt to perform for the Free Churches a service parallel to that which the Modern Churchmen's Conference has rendered to the Anglican body. There is no doubt that such a movement is needed. The laity of our Churches are puzzled by the ill-proportioned reports of speeches by this or that religious leader, and by partial glimpses of the results of criticism. Our ministers are more instructed, but for the most part work in comparative isolation and are in doubt what publicly to surrender and on what to make a stand. How far does new truth compel them to go in the teeth of traditional orthodoxy? How can they renew their hearers' interest in the things that cannot be shaken? Plainly there are many doctrines

which do not seem to retain their old force. In how many cases is the change merely one of seeming; in how many must we frankly abandon the old statement? The younger people of our Churches are demanding guidance, and for want of it many are unsettled, while some have already left the Church. The answer cannot be left to one here and there. We must come together and, in the spirit of prayer, test the foundations of our Christian belief, so that we may know what to revise and what to reaffirm. If men humbly ask for wisdom from God, they have the right to expect it.

The Committee desire that the meetings shall be for genuine conference rather than for instruction or exhortation. For that reason they have not gone outside the Congregational body for speakers, and the business of those invited will be to open discussions in which much of the best contribution should be provided by the rank and file. Times of devotion wil be arranged each day.

The range covered by the title is too large to allow any Conference to traverse it in one year. (The practice of the Modern Churchmen's Conference corroborates this view.) The promoters look forward to repeat this Conference annually as long as there is a demand for what such a method can give. Other aspects of our problem must be examined on future occasions.

We wish this venture of faith every success, and shall hope to give our readers an account of its proceedings. It is by the Modernist road, and the Modernist road alone, that the reunion of Christendom will be achieved. It is the most difficult and dangerous and laborious of all roads: it depends for its success upon imparting a modern Christian education to vast multitudes of traditionalist Christians: when this has been done a new spirit and outlook will permeate the separated and separatist Christian communions of to-day, and the barriers which divide them will then be seen to be as unsubstantial as they are artificial, the *damnosa haereditas* of a traditionalist past, the lingering taint of whose psychology remains even when the misconceptions, prejudices, and passions which created it have been abolished.

We venture to hope that the other Free Church Communions will follow the Congregationalist lead. We look forward at a later period to great Modernist Conferences in which the Modernists of all our Christian Churches or sects will take part together. In the earlier stages of the Modernist movement the Modernist in each separated communion must begin by cultivating his own garden, but that is only as a preliminary to that later stage of co-operative endeavour when Modernism will become both interdenominational and international.

English Modernists will be glad to learn that the Modernists in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America are repeating the experiment of last year and are holding a Conference at Philadelphia this month. They hope to have some two hundred clergymen and several bishops at their gathering.

Christianity in the Public Schools.

The *Church Times* of January 28, in a leading article 'The Poor Little Rich Child,' and in a special contribution 'The Problem of Young Men' by 'A Layman,' criticizes very severely the religion of the Public Schools.

'A Layman,' in telling his readers about Public School religion, tells them rather more about himself than he is perhaps aware:

> 'Let us take as an example Confirmation . . . A personal reminiscence may not be irrelevant, because it is really typical. At my public school—it was an "average" one—I was prepared for Confirmation by my tutor, a layman and a tolerably good fellow. I am sure he taught me little doctrine, because afterwards I found I knew none. Certainly he never told me anything definite about the Sacraments—anything so surprising as the Real Presence would assuredly have remained in my memory. The words of the Catechism, learned parrot-wise, the correct procedure on going up to the altar to receive the Sacrament, and the odd admonition to "be good and develop character, and you'll develop thin, firm lips and a strong chin," represent all the teaching that I can recall having received from him.'

According to 'A Layman,' the root cause of this depressing situation is that the Catholic system is not taught in the Public Schools. A religion 'which centres on the Sacrament of the Altar and gives guidance and hope through the Sacrament of Penance' is what the English public school boy needs; but the traditions of English official Protestantism, in which our headmasters are steeped, cause them to turn with horror from this ideal and to strive instead to equip their boys with ethical armour which proves powerless to enable them to resist successfully the assaults of temptation. 'A Layman's' conclusion is that the Catholic Religion will never be taught in the Public Schools until

> 'They have secured Catholic-minded priests as chaplains, men imbued with a love of souls and a sanctified common-sense. When these are allowed to order the religion of the boys in their own way, without interference from lay headmasters, tutors and house-masters, and without those irritating restraints on the full presentation of the

> Catholic Faith dictated by the English vice of compromise, we shall hear less of those dark, unhappy scandals which result in constantly recurring expulsions and the damnation of souls not yet come to maturity.'

The writer of the leading article is not less severe, perhaps we ought to say, virulent. To the Public Schools he attributes the paganizing of the English governing classes:

> It is a hard fact, and we shall be assailed for stating it, that the public schools have played a large part in that paganizing of the governing classes which finds its expression in the hectic pursuit of vulgar, brainless 'pleasure,' and is the greatest asset of the preacher of the class war. We are aware of the temptation of exaggerating the evils of one's own time. But it cannot be denied that among the leisured and the wealthy to-day there are a smiling tolerance of the foul, an absorbing interest in the futile, and a weary indifference to the things that matter. And since such evidence of decadence is most conspicuous among the young, it is schoolmasters and their system that stand condemned with parents and their selfish disregard of their children's eternal welfare.

Charges of this kind are very difficult to refute. The ideal of our Public School masters is to develop the character of their charges, not primarily to teach them religion. All probably recognise the value, in varying degrees, of Confirmation, Scripture teaching, and chapel services, in assisting the development of character, but the success or failure in training the boy's character is judged, not by whether he becomes a professing Christian and devout communicant, but by whether he is honourable, hard-working, sportsmanlike, public-spirited. That the Public Schools had attained no mean measure of success was proved in the fiery trial of the late war. The public school boy proved himself able to lead and able to obey. Brave, modest, cheerful, humane, he won the respect of those with whom he served. We have no intention of making odious comparisons, but neither commanders nor men wanted anything better, and certainly they did not get it. Our Lord's test of His religion was the very simple one: 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' and by that test the public school boy was justified. It may be contended that though he did well in the war, he does not do well in public life. Those who know something of public life —by which we do not mean mainly political life, but that less dazzling sphere which attracts neither parvenus nor adventurers, where public service is unpaid and recognition in the form of

public honours is unknown—here the old public school boy can be relied on to do his share and more than his share. Whether you come across him driving sheep on an Australian backwoods station, or doing administrative or educational work in Africa, or managing a rubber plantation in the Asiatic archipelago, you meet a man with ideals and one who can be trusted to support a good cause. To the clergy he is invariably courteous and even helpful. These remarks refer mainly to the older type, the product of Arnold's great reformation of the public schools, but there is no need to assume that the newer type is not as good. The reports that the post-war public school boy is a class-conscious, lazy, selfish, pleasure-loving individualist, without ideals and without initiative, appear to have no real justification. It is true that the public schools are not providing as many ordinands as formerly, but that is perhaps not a little due to the unreformed and reactionary character of some of our church life, the decline in the social status of our clergy, the substitution of a series of stunts for intelligent educational and pastoral work, and the great increase of new spheres of work for public school men in commerce, education, and imperial administration.

We are convinced that the catholicizing of public school religion will not improve matters : modernizing it would achieve this end, provided the modernizing were, as we have little doubt it would be, judicious, positive, reverent, practical. There is no need to introduce Catholic chaplains who will train the boys to come to Confession. A sympathetic and perceptive housemaster is well able to act as a true father in God to his boys and help them to overcome their weaknesses and conquer their temptations. The true priest is a human personality filled with the Spirit of Christ, and that there are many such among the unordained masters in our public schools there is no doubt.

To be quite frank, it is not clear that clergymen make better masters than laymen ; nor is there any reason to believe that the tone and morality of Roman Catholic schools or Anglo-Catholic schools are better than those of the ordinary English public school.

What we have in our English public schools, although the *Church Times* refuses to recognise the fact, is a form of the Christian Religion which can claim in the light of Christ's test

to be more truly Christian than much that calls itself Catholic. This lay kind of Christianity, as was Jesus Himself, is afraid of externalism and professionalism. It knows nothing of sacerdotalism nor ecclesiasticism. It does not encourage petty pieties. Doubtless there are some boys who would be most helped by a religion of another kind: they are, we believe, a small minority. Public school religion ought not to be altered to suit them: but they might very properly be sent to specialized schools where their type of religion is inculcated.

Mr. Arnold Lunn and Disestablishment.

Mr. Arnold Lunn, the brilliant son of Sir Henry Lunn, contributes to the *Review of the Churches* for January, 1927, a notice of *England* by the Dean of St. Paul's, in which the following paragraph appears:

> The Dean is indeed the best argument for the Establishment. An electorate of priests and deacons would never have sent Dr. Inge to St. Paul's. Well-endowed deaneries are the best excuse for the Established Church. Qualities, other than those of the evangelist and the missionary are of value to the Church militant. And in England, more than elsewhere, it is essential to provide an intellectual critic of established shibboleths with the widest possible platform. The English love shibboleths and dislike the harsh pain of thought. 'Force is no remedy,' said Bright . . . very silly nonsense, but thousands of people have repeated this nonsense in sapient variations ever since. We are, of course, slowly losing our old confidence in the well-worn dogmas of Victorian Liberalism. We are ceasing to believe that we can cure all national ills by giving more votes to more people, or all International ills by giving more parliaments to more peoples. And men like the Dean who force us to think and who challenge us to prove our premises, perform a valuable function in the Church. It is the glory of Anglicanism that it is catholic enough to include men like the late Bishop of Zanzibar and the present Dean of St. Paul's. Thanks to the Establishment, we can still provide scholarly priests with Deaneries in order that there may be no interruption in the apostolic succession of scholarship in the national Church. In the disestablished and democratic Church of the future there will be no room for independent thinkers and no leisure for scholars.

It is highly significant that Mr. Arnold Lunn should express such a view. He has not inherited it like some old-fashioned Victorian 'Church and State' man: he is a Georgian, and has been converted to it. That is why his expression of it is so significant. It is possible that it marks the turn of the tide. In both ecclesiastical and democratic circles the popular demand is for Church Disestablishment. Establishment, it is urged, conflicts

with democratic principles as it does with the ideal of ecclesiastical autonomy. The slogan, which we believe goes back to Cavour, is 'A Free Church in a Free State.' It is interesting to observe how it is working out at present in Italy. In England, however, we are told that ecclesiastical autonomy forbids the appointment of Church officials by the Crown, but demands their appointment by ecclesiastical assemblies: it is the fashion to call these ecclesiastical assemblies *representative*, but that they are not. They do not represent the will of the great majority of the laity, and are never likely to do so. What they really represent is the policy of an ecclesiastical bureaucracy, as that bureaucracy is well aware. Certainly they are not democratic. If this fact could be realized, it might lead to public opinion being turned against Disestablishment. Neither the English nation, nor the great bulk of English Churchmen, have anything to gain by Disestablishment, but much to lose.

Establishment, if the Bishops are loyal to the Church's constitution, is the great protector of the rights of the laity, who themselves have little leisure and ability for that ceaseless vigilance and activity upon which the protection of rights depends.

Establishment is also the great protector of the comprehensiveness of the Church. All the disestablished or unestablished churches in the Anglican Communion are narrower than the Church of England. For instance, it is impossible for a strong Evangelical clergyman to thrive in the South African Church, or a strong Anglo-Catholic priest in the Church of Ireland.

Establishment is also the great protector of the independence of the clergy. By 'the independence of the clergy,' we do not mean either clerical tyranny or clerical license, but a Church constitution which grants the clergy reasonable and indefeasible rights, on the possession and exercise of which the welfare of the Church, and their own influence as an order, depend.

It is sometimes urged that Dissenters have much to gain by Disestablishment. We regard this as a mistaken view. Disestablishment would give the less noble Dissenters the opportunity of gratifying an unchristian *Schadenfreude*, but no solid advantages. Disestablishment would strengthen two forces in the country to which all religious Dissenters are opposed, namely, Secularism and Romanism. All who desire union with Rome

desire Disestablishment, and all who desire the supremacy of Rome in this country desire Disestablishment; equally all who desire Secularism desire Disestablishment; for Establishment is the great bulwark of the national religion against Romanism and against Secularism.

Modern Churchmen have no desire to see preserved an Established Church of England, which comprises only a minority of the nation, surrounded by a multitude of non-Established communions. What we desire is to see an Established Church so comprehensive that the Free Churches could usefully and happily find their true home in it. We could wish that it were possible to form a strong society of English Churchmen and Free Churchmen to explore the possibilities of such a policy. Such is greatly needed.

As to-day there is a grave danger of irreparable injury and loss being inflicted on our national inheritance by the demolition of ancient buildings which we cannot replace by anything half as good, so there is a similar danger threatening our national institutions, and the noblest, most ancient, and potentially the most useful, is the Established Church of England.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

By the Rev. J. S. Bezzant, M.A., Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

THE Fourth Gospel possesses a peculiar fascination for Christian faith and scholarship. This is due not only to its character so aptly described by Clement of Alexandria as 'a spiritual Gospel,' but also because the historical criticism of it raises serious, perhaps the most serious, problems for traditional Christian theology. The Fourth Gospel rather than the other three was the foundation and the apparent justification of that series of Christological statements which culminated in the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon. This Gospel is therefore of profound significance for those who believe the truth of Christianity to be enshrined in, and therefore the value of Christianity to depend on, the traditional Christology. Among scholars who are conservative in their criticism

of the Synoptic Gospels, it is possible to find, in regard to the Fourth, the widest differences of opinion. These range from that which regards the Gospel as the work of John the Apostle and son of Zebedee who therein records actual events and sayings in the earthly life of Jesus on which he had meditated for half a century, to that which regards it not as history but as 'an inspired interpretation of the person and the work of Christ addressed to the third generation of Christians,' written, not by one of the Twelve, but by some later and possibly unknown disciple.

The identification of the writer is perhaps a matter of greater difficulty than importance. For our present purpose it is not of first importance, since value and significance must in the last resort depend less on the identity of the writer than on what he has written. There were three notable Johns in the early Church: John the Apostle and son of Zebedee: John the Seer, the author of the Apocalypse: and John the Elder (*i.e.* the Presbyter). John the Elder seems to have lived at Ephesus, the place with which the Fourth Gospel is from the first associated. The probability is that John the Apostle suffered martyrdom before the destruction of Jerusalem, and that John the Elder (known as 'the disciple of the Lord'), the author of the Johannine Epistles, also wrote the Fourth Gospel at a date near the very end of the first century. He was later and wrongly identified with the son of Zebedee, but it is probable that he had known Jesus in the flesh.

I.

(*a*) There are few questions which it is more difficult and more absurd to answer with dogmatic assurance than the question: How far the *events* of the ministry of Jesus as recorded in the Fourth Gospel correspond with the historical facts? This aspect of the question of its historical value is raised at once by any comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the other three. The length of the ministry, its order and its place, the people to whom it was offered, the miracles which accompanied it, and the date of its termination by the Crucifixion—on all these matters the Fourth is in real or apparent conflict with the Synoptic Gospels. Nevertheless, the evidence that John knew the Gospel of Mark is summed up by Canon Streeter as amounting to little short of demonstration, yet it must be added that in some

instances his divergences from that Gospel cannot possibly be harmonized. If Jesus was only arrested once in Gethsemane and, as Mark states, Judas pointed him out to the temple-police by kissing him, it cannot also be true, as John records, that Jesus went outside the garden and gave himself up. Again, did Jesus bear his cross as in John or did Simon the Cyrenian bear it for him as in Mark? Admittedly the contradiction in respect of the date of the Crucifixion is absolute. In John, Jesus is crucified on the 13th Nisan, and in Mark on the 14th. In other instances perhaps the conflict is more apparent than real. There are several indications in John that the author knew of a ministry in Galilee which the Synoptists relate, and there are some indications in the Synoptists of an early Judaean ministry which John relates. The Johannine chronology is probably more correct than the brief period which the Synoptists suggest for the length of the ministry. We need not labour these points. So far as the narration of *events* in the life of Jesus is concerned, it would be generally admitted nowadays that the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel cannot be played off against each other in a series of rigid antitheses. It seems clear that the author of the Fourth Gospel sometimes deliberately corrects the earlier Gospels, and where he does so, it may frequently happen that he is nearer the truth than they are. This is of course more probable if he can be identified as John the Apostle, because in that case his Gospel is the work of a companion of Jesus, which the other Gospels are not. It is, however, of very little significance even for traditional theology, and of no significance for religion, whether the Temple was cleansed at the beginning or at the end of the ministry, or whether it was twice cleansed.

(*b*) The contrast between the Synoptic and the Johannine presentations of the Person of Christ is more serious. The Jesus of John is not baptized unto the remission of sins, nor does he endure temptation. He suffers no agony in Gethsemane. The tears by the grave of Lazarus, if the story be regarded as history, are rather artificial if, as John makes clear, Jesus knew all the time how easily the scene of mourning could be transformed into one of joy. If on the Cross he says, 'I thirst,' it is in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled. In the Synoptists Jesus frequently prays, and seeks solitude for the exercise. In John, though his communion with his heavenly Father is unbroken,

he very seldom prays at all. When he does, the following is typical: 'Father, I thank thee that thou heardest me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the multitude which standeth around I said it, that they may believe that thou didst send me.' The purpose of the prayer is that it may be heard of men and the fact is publicly explained to God. Throughout the Fourth Gospel the knowledge possessed by Jesus is superhuman, and that not in the sense in which penetrating insight could be so described. He knows the past history of the Samaritan woman: though the message he receives about Lazarus is only of his sickness, yet Jesus knows when he is dead. He knows from the first that Judas will betray him. However difficult it may be on the slender evidence we possess to attempt to trace any ordered development in the self-consciousness of Jesus, it is generally admitted that there is some development in the Synoptists. The statement that 'Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and men' affirms it. There is nothing of the kind in the Fourth Gospel, in which Jesus is indeed 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.'[1] His Messiahship and divine Sonship are known from the outset, and form the main theme of his discourses. In the Synoptists the main theme is 'the Kingdom' with expositions of its laws and principles and the moral conditions essential to participation in it. In the Synoptists we have a picture of Jesus which appeals both to the moral consciousness and also, though in varying degrees, to the historical sense. In spite of the apocalyptic Messianism of Matthew and Mark, the figure is actual and life-like. If it transcends what we know as human, it never forces itself upon our consciousness as more than human. In the Fourth Gospel we have another record of the same life which does not appeal in the same ways, even though, in a different sense, its appeal may be stronger. The Synoptic Gospels give us narrative and teaching which for the most part are left to interpret themselves: the Fourth Gospel provides an elaborate mystical theism. It is often impossible to distinguish the supposed words of Jesus from the comments of the Evangelist: all the characters speak in the same style of language, which is also that of the First Epistle of John, where it is manifestly that of the author. Though there can be no doubt that the Fourth

[1] *Hebrews* xiii, 8.

Evangelist regards and is anxious to stress Jesus as a historica figure, he nevertheless treats of him from the point of viev and often in the terms of theism. Ignoring his entrance into th world, even by a miraculous birth, he tells of One pre-existen and co-existent with God, who became flesh without ceasing t be 'in heaven,' to which place or state there is no account o his return, for he has never left it.

(*c*) It was admitted by Bishop Westcott that the Fourt Gospel, though making use of history, gives the author's inter pretation of it more fully and more freely than is the case wit the other three Gospels. Purely objective history of pas events is not attainable, and would not be of much use t religion if it were. But it is impossible for the scientific historia to abandon the attempt to distinguish between true interpreta tion and false interpretation, particularly when he has to dea with conflicting interpretations. To-day the conservative posi tion with regard to the Fourth Gospel admits it to be not a com plete account of the life of Jesus, and further admits that it doe not preserve features which were certainly prominent in his life that it does, in fact, deliberately confine itself to certain aspect of the person, life, and work of Jesus. Of course the Gospe is not necessarily unhistorical because it is selective and illus trative, and there is no doubt that it contains matter of his torical value. Once and again, both in incidents, in the pre sentation of Jesus, and occasionally in his manner of speech, w find ourselves in the presence of the Jesus whom we have me in the Synoptic Gospels: but where it is otherwise, as for th most part it is, the most we can say is that the historical trut of each Johannine narrative or saying must be decided, in as fa as it can be decided at all, independently on the merits of th case. The days are past when, on this aspect of the problem 'the dogmatic affirmations of the blatant ignoramus whethe pietist or sceptic' are of any value. On the other hand, it woul be as intolerable as it would be ridiculous if the reality an assurances of religion had to depend on the result of dispute between learned critics as to the historical truth of this or tha saying or claim in the Fourth or in any other Gospel. The out standing fact of the modern study of *John*, the fact which doe affect traditional *theology*, is this. In the Fourth Gospel th Messianic claim and the claim to divine sonship is made b

Jesus himself over and over again: it is the engrossing theme of his discourses, and the Jews are condemned for not believing it. In the Synoptists it is equally clear that Jesus desired to conceal his Messiahship. Demoniacs, sick folk, and disciples alike are charged not to publish it. That reticence must stand as history. The circumstances of the life of Jesus provide the sufficient reason for it, and the disciples would not have invented it afterwards. In this, at least, the Fourth Gospel cannot stand as a historical authority. No doubt the 'either . . or' dilemma has often been overdone, or even invented where it does not exist, but if we are to refuse to face it where it manifestly does exist, all critical historical enquiry is useless, and we had better betake ourselves frankly to the task of apologetic on behalf of whatever tradition has asserted.

(*d*) Much the same can be definitely said about the type of teaching and style of language which are characteristic of the Fourth Gospel. The startling differences in this respect between the Synoptists and *John* cannot be explained satisfactorily by saying that the Synoptic teaching represents that given to simple people in Galilee and the Johannine teaching represents that given to the sophisticated Jews in Jerusalem. This convenient hypothesis is rendered useless by the fact that one of the longest, most obscure, and most characteristic of Johannine discourses, that on the Bread of Life, is represented as spoken not in Jerusalem, but in Galilee. And why should typically Johannine speech and teaching have been suitable for the Samaritan woman, but not suitable for those simple Galileans who heard Jesus gladly? I do not see how the existence in the Fourth Gospel of any amount of detail which may be historically true can alter the general conclusion that in most that relates to the person, claim, and teaching of Jesus while on earth, it is of far less value than the other three Gospels. It is not too much to say that if Jesus taught openly in the way John records, teaching which again and again led to serious public controversy, but occasionally to its open acceptance, we cannot understand why anyone should ever have produced such documents as the Synoptic Gospels. Why does the primitive Church in Jerusalem, as we see it in the early chapters of *Acts*, in the very city which is claimed as the scene of the stupendous utterances of the Johannine Christ, appear to be in ignorance of them and to hold a

simple Christology like that of Mark? *Mark*, *Q*, the peculia matter in *Luke* and that peculiar to *Matthew*—all these collec tions of sayings and events seem to have been made and pub lished before and in preference to those in *John*. In other words the most definite and explicit claims of Christ seem to have bee unknown to the Church generally for three-quarters of a centur after they were publicly uttered, and after the Resurrectio would have appeared to guarantee their truth! We must con clude that if our desire is to see Jesus as he walked the hills an fields and towns by the lake of Galilee, the Fourth Gospe though it cannot be set aside as wholly useless for this purpose is none the less quite definitely not of great significance for it.

II.

(*a*) As we do not know who was the author of the Fourth Gospel, nor what precise occasion moved him to write, we canno be sure of its main purpose. But if we bear in mind that it wa written a generation later than the Apostolic Age when th Christian religion, in its Gentile environment, had to cope wit conditions very different from those in which it originated, an had for this reason to reinterpret its message, a great deal of th original theological significance of the Fourth Gospel become clear to us. When it was written, the actual life of Jesus wa already a distant memory. Of those who had accompanied him there was probably none remaining. The idea of an eternal an heavenly Logos, and therefore of an eternal and heavenly Christ, was one quite in harmony with contemporary Hellenic speculative thought. There seems to be no doubt that the autho of the Fourth Gospel tries to present the story of the origin o Christianity, and its essence, in a form congenial to this atmos phere. At the same time, he is fully alive to the necessity o preserving and stressing the reality of the life of Jesus on earth which, perhaps unintentionally assisted by the teaching of St Paul, was in danger of becoming of no account. The *First Epistle of John* shows more definite consciousness of this danger and of its consequences. There were those who, while apparently confessing the eternal Son, denied that he had come in the flesh denied the reality of his death, and claimed to know Christ with out keeping his commandments. John allows and even heightens

all the glory which this type of thought ascribed to the eternal Son, but he insists on much more. The ideal had become actual and had lived a real human life in the person of Jesus. The idea that the eternal and divine Logos had become man stopped at the fountain head all Gnostic theologies of divine and semi-divine emanations. Hence this Gospel is silent about all intermediate beings: its only devil is the principle of evil personified: no demons are cast out, nor are there any angelic spirits. Faith and knowledge are processes (*πιστεύειν*, *γινώσκειν*, believing and knowing), and the definitely Gnostic words (*γνῶσις*, *πίστις*, *σοφία*, knowledge, faith, wisdom) are avoided. When John rejects the Synoptic statement that Simon of Cyrene carried the cross for Jesus and says that Jesus carried it for himself, he undoubtedly wishes to deny the Docetic belief that the divine could not possibly have suffered and the consequent assertion that Simon was crucified in the stead of Jesus.

Withal, John's attitude to this type of speculation was sufficiently ambiguous to enable later Gnostics to claim his Gospel in support of theirs: and in justification of their claim they could point not only to the almost complete *ἀπάθεια* of a Christ who manifested no traces of physical, mental, or moral development, but also to the fact that the Gospel identifies eternal life with knowing God. The explanation of this ambiguity seems to be that the Gnosticism John has in mind is not the fully-developed forms met with in the second century, but Gnosticism in its earlier and incipient stages. John is anxious to allow for its value where he can, provided the historical reality of Jesus is not thereby lost. As E. F. Scott says, 'He stands for the historical tradition as against the attempts to dissolve it in a vague idealism.' Like the Gnostics, his main interest is in the eternal and spiritual world. He does not start with the historically actual, but unlike the Gnostics, he perceives that Christianity depended on keeping the bond between the eternal and the spiritual, and the Figure who had brought it to men. He uses history, but for a purpose. The great principles of the identification of Jesus with the eternal Logos and the reality of the human life of Jesus having been established, he seems to have been for the most part content to relate as historical fact what, from those principles, he inferred must have been, rather than

what actually had been. He probably had but little interest in the distinction.

(*b*) The Johannine presentation of the Logos Christ also freed the Church from Jewish Messianic ideas: it gave a death-blow to the popular hope of an early return of an apocalyptic Messiah upon the clouds who should then judge the living and the risen dead. Had these crude expectations been taken over by the Church and preserved unchanged, their non-fulfilment would have wrecked the Church. When John identifies the Messiah with the eternal Son of God who is in the fullest sense divine (θεός) whose second coming he equates with the presence of the Paraclete dwelling in the heart of the believer, the earlier and cruder hope became insignificant: where it could not die it was relegated to the distant future. The expected millennial kingdom was supplanted by the ideal of the Christian Church. Men are judged already according as they respond, or do not respond, to the revelation of God in Christ; and from the story of the raising of Lazarus a higher belief is extracted than that he should rise again at the last day. 'He that liveth and believeth on me shall never die'; and here neither the living nor the dying refers to the flesh.

In many other respects the author of the Fourth Gospel deals with opposition to Christianity as it existed at the end of the first century. He meets current questionings and objections by producing sayings of Christ which are anticipatory answers to or refutations of them. In doing so he necessarily reads back contemporary conditions into the time of Jesus. The hatred of 'the Jews,' as Christians experienced it, appears in this Gospel as existing in the early days of the ministry of Jesus. Even the use of that designation for the opponents of Jesus indicates the point of view from which the author writes. Jesus himself and his followers were all Jews. To try by that name to distinguish between Jesus and his opponents, is, as has been said, rather like trying to distinguish Catholics and Evangelicals by speaking of 'the Churchmen.' But despite the hostility of the author to 'the Jews' and though he regards the rejection of Jesus as due to the spiritual deadness of those who chose darkness rather than the light, nevertheless in the most important doctrine of theology, that of God, John is not anti-Jewish. God is the

'Righteous Father' of Jesus: the Temple is 'my Father's house'; 'Salvation is from the Jews': 'An Israelite indeed' is the praise accorded to one in whom is no guile. Moses is a forerunner of Christ whose 'day' had been seen by Abraham. Yet, more definitely than St. Paul, John sets aside the Law. The most real Temple is the 'body' of Jesus, and the Jewish reason for Sabbath commemoration disappears in an assertion that God never ceases to work. New birth, not descent from Abraham, gives admission to and gains the seal of Divine favour. No holy places, whether 'in this mountain' or 'in Jerusalem,' are necessary for the worship of the Father who is Spirit and seeks as worshippers those who worship in spirit and in truth.

III.

We will consider briefly the significance of the Fourth Gospel for ourselves. The first verses of the Gospel state the author's conception of the Logos which, he believed, 'was made flesh and tabernacled among us' in Jesus. For him the conception was all-important: for us it is a precarious and unverifiable theory. On all such questions as the *mode* of the Divine existence, or whether there be a second Divine existence distinct from yet not separate from God the Father, we shall feel that the only true answer is that we do not know. It is very doubtful if, even for the thought of John's day, the Logos doctrine and the complete incarnation of the divine Logos in a single historical figure could really be harmonized. Nor does the vital teaching of the Gospel depend for its validity on the Alexandrine philosophy in which John set it forth. The great value of the Gospel is that it does, more consistently than the other Gospels, set forth what its author believed to be the significance of the historical person of Jesus: and it is not only with facts, but with the significance and value of facts that religion is concerned. All the critical effort spent in attempting to see Jesus as he walked on earth has for its religious motive not only the desire to know the truth, but also that we may thereby see more clearly the significance of Jesus and endeavour ourselves so to walk even as he walked. It would be quite possible to know exactly what manner of man Jesus was and yet for such knowledge to have no religious value whatever. Whatever may be the case for certain formal expres-

sions of traditional theology, for religion the important question is not whether the Fourth Gospel portrait of Jesus is life-like as judged by the conditions of his earthly life, but rather how far it correctly represents the significance of the life which in fact we find depicted with greater historical accuracy in the Synoptic Gospels. The important thing is not whether Jesus did or did not claim to be the Light of the World, but whether in fact he has proved so to be. If he has proved to be the Light of the World, then we value the Fourth Gospel as being the first clearly to perceive the fact. If Jesus has not proved to be the Light of the World, the fact that he had claimed to be would but increase its darkness. The spirit of Jesus as we see it in the Synoptic Gospels, can become in us a fountain of water springing up unto eternal life whether or not the discourse with the woman of Samaria was actually spoken by him.

Although the Logos doctrine as it is stated in the Fourth Gospel has largely lost its meaning for us, the idea implies a spiritual conception of God not unlike modern conceptions of Divine immanence. It is that the Divine Power which is 'other' than we, upon whom we and all things depend, dwells also in us and in the world. Like John, we see its supreme revelation in Jesus of Nazareth. We are much more concerned with the *nature* of the God thus revealed to us than with the mode of His existence. The moral character of God is summed up as Love as implicitly in the Gospel as explicitly in the First Epistle. Such words as 'The Father loveth the Son,' 'Even as the Father hath loved me, I also have loved you,' 'That the love wherewith thou lovest me may be in them,' indicate that the author of the Gospel regarded love as of the inmost nature of God, just as the Synoptists show it to have been the very nature of Christ himself, and of his teaching about God. Because of this, it is of the essence of Christianity to 'know him,' which John emphasizes to mean the keeping of his commandments; and keeping his commandments means not an outward obedience to precepts, but the inward spirit which accepts and lives by the values represented by his life and cross. To know God and Jesus, says John, is eternal life, which is thus seen to be the same thing as the Synoptic Kingdom of God which means the mode of life in which the Divine will is known and done. The

Fourth Gospel does not give us ready-made, infallible metaphysical information, but it correctly points out the only way by which we can find a Gospel of life in the story that has come down to us from the past, or know it as a present, living Power.

The Fourth Gospel also gives us a conception of the true nature of the work of Christ, which is as valid to-day as when the author set it forth. In his opinion the purpose, wherefore Jesus had come, was that men might have life and have it in abundance. John tells us that it is for the same purpose that he records some of the many signs which Jesus did. Whatever varying content men may give to the words, 'more abundant life' summarizes their deepest need. It is the experience of those who have tried it that precisely this results from the sincere attempt to face and live life in the spirit in which Jesus lived it. Fundamental in that spirit was the complete consecration to his Mission, to his work. It is not merely the doctrinal significance of the 'works' that John stresses. He shows that, like St. Paul, necessity was laid upon Jesus in doing his work. There is, for example, the saying which Huxley regarded as the finest in the New Testament, 'I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work.' Life and work really are as inseparable in experience as they are in the Fourth Gospel, in which it is insisted that just as Christ has a definite work to do, so that work has its claim upon those who share his life. What is that work? Is it something so different from what we may do as to be impossible of performance by us? Christians have often found the excellence of the work of Christ in the supposed fact that it is. The work of Christ, it has been said, was his death, a work *for* us rather than *in* us. It was said that the work of St. Paul depended on his life, that of Christ on his death; and on his death, not as the inevitable climax of his life, but as the main purpose of his life, thus enabling an all-loving Omnipotence to reconcile the conflict between justice and mercy. No doubt such ideas are not without support in the Fourth Gospel. In identifying Jesus with the true Paschal lamb who taketh away the sins of the world, John spoke in figures appropriate to his own age rather than to ours. But there is another view of the matter in the Gospel. The great prayer in chapter xvii is a worker's farewell to an already accom-

plished task. The idea of atonement is not mentioned, nor sin. It makes clear wherein the excellence of the work consists. namely, in the education of the band of disciples to appreciate the divine nature, and Jesus looks forward to the extension of such appreciation in the future. 'I manifested thy Name unto the men whom thou gavest me out of the world.' He mentions, by implication, his death, but only as the termination of his labour. It is the confirmation of his already accomplished task of manifesting the Father.

Further, the Gospel conceives the death of Christ as making possible his return as an all-pervading spiritual presence to abide with his people for ever. It is this principle of inward life and of ever fresh development which alone makes our own membership in the Church at all possible. The earthly life of Jesus, so far from exhausting his revelation of God, only began it. The Fourth Gospel itself illustrates its own great theme when it represents Jesus as speaking no longer in the parables of the Synoptic Gospels, but in language suitable to a later day and other conditions than those of Galilee. There can be no doubt that John thought his Gospel expressed the mind of Christ as it had been revealed to him by Christ himself. What he did we must do. 'Art thou a King then?' He came to promote in the world a spiritual kingdom—that kingdom of heaven which some interpreted in a materialist sense, some in an eschatological sense, some in an ecclesiastical sense, but which John interprets in a spiritual and personal sense. It is an inward present, not only an outward future reality. Yet it is as a member of a society rather than as an individual that man stands before God : it is as a member of a society that he shares the common Divine or eternal life. It is here that we reach the heart of the message of the Fourth Gospel : herein is its main significance. It gives us a Gospel by which we can live, in which we can experiment, and which we can increasingly verify. We shall never understand John unless we see in his Gospel the expression of a profound personal, experimental religion. Eternal life for him was an experience, rather than an idea. He could not conceive that it could pass away even when the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life should in death be reduced to dust and ashes. That is why eschatology is of no importance to him.

'Where I am, there ye shall be also,' but whether on a transformed and glorified earth, or in another unknown spiritual universe does not matter. The Fourth Gospel insists on the reality of a spiritual world of which the seen and temporal is but a part, but a real part. This faith answers to experience. On the one hand, except for the very few in whom the consciousness of the spiritual predominates more than it does in most of us, wretched conditions of life make the higher spiritual life unattainable. On the other hand, to seek only the good things of the material world and to care nothing for the infinite possibilities and eternal destiny of the higher life, means that the deepest human longings will never be satisfied. Our present duty is clear; but unless we hold that our earthly home will never cease to be, we must either believe that the spiritual world exists independently of, however closely connected with the visible earthly world, or else acknowledge that all our efforts will eventually come to nothing, and that all our ideals and values are but illusions which must ultimately be fruitless. The glory of the Fourth Gospel is that it neglects neither world, but affirms the reality of both. Just as for John the ideal had, in Jesus, become actual, so we, who must share his work, must strive to make the eternal truth and goodness into present fact. No doubt John regarded conscious acceptance of the exalted Saviour as the only means to the higher life. Experience forces us to be gladly less exclusive, though John's horror at the denial of the Son of God is horror at the denial of the principle of the Christian life as he understood it, not at the denial of intellectual statement. Withal, like the Modernist, John acknowledges that our knowledge even of ourselves and of our destiny is incomplete. 'Now are we sons of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be.' Still less, therefore, have we complete knowledge of God. Perplexity there must often be: but it is when we regard Christianity not as a way of life, but as something which dispels all perplexities by explanation, that we create the most insoluble perplexities for ourselves. But, as Dr. Jacks has written, that which in us feels perplexity is the noblest part of us. That is why we never despair, and, like John, whatever else fails, we know that when we love we have passed from death into life, the more abundant life that is life indeed.

THE NEW CATHEDRAL

By the Rev. C. E. Raven, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Liverpool.

'WHAT does Liverpool Cathedral stand for?' That is the question which the Editor has asked me to answer. In attempting to do so, it would perhaps be best to summarize, so far as possible, the 'common mind' of the Principal Chapter. We are, and have been from the first, a very united body: on questions of principle there has not been as yet any serious divergence between us. But I feel that it would be unfair to commit my colleagues in any way to what must certainly be an inadequate statement of our ideals. So what follows must be taken merely as an individual opinion—though it represents a point of view which I believe to be shared by us all.

To answer as shortly as possible would be to say that it stands for the expression in a Cathedral of our conception of God, the conception which has been recovered and emphasized by the development of human thought and activity during the epoch of the scientific movement. To describe this conception in detail would be to write a treatise: to summarize it we should agree to point to the Johannine definition, 'Light, life, love.' Whether or no the Fourth Gospel can be accepted as history may be doubted. It contains at least a religious and theological interpretation of the Christian experience, an exposition of the Kingdom of God to which the thought of to-day turns with eagerness. In its freedom from ecclesiasticism, in its hold upon spiritual reality, in its universal scope, in its grandeur and its simplicity, it illuminates and is illuminated by the conception of the Universe and of God to which the best minds of to-day are being led by their studies of the world and of humanity. To see mankind as already, if they recognise it, God's family, to acknowledge all art, all knowledge, all friendliness and all honest effort as inspired by Him, to help each man and woman and child to live in more conscious communion with the Eternal, and to unite them in worship and service to the Father of whom Jesus is the incarnation and the Spirit of Holiness the epiphany, this would be to recover for the Church its position as the representative of the whole Godward progress of His creatures.

Such a faith received a striking endorsement at the Church Congress last October at Southport, when a representative body of Churchmen, theologians, psychologists, scientists, artists and social workers united to emphasize a conception of God of which the characteristic features were common to them all.[1] Certainly it is the simple desire to express in aesthetic, intellectual, and moral form our worship of the Eternal Godhead that has dictated and unified our practical proposals. To help the people of a great industrial city to realise the fact of God, to give them a home where they can gather as his family, to let that home reveal His beauty, His wisdom, His love; to satisfy so far as we can their various needs and to provide for them opportunities suited to a wide diversity of temperament and calling; and this not in order that religion may be associated solely with the Cathedral, but that those who see God there may find Him present and active in all the common ways of life: that is our single aim. Such a statement may seem grandiose—or a mere platitude. It is essential to make it, because it is due to our constant sense of this one end that we have been able to avoid all controversy over matters of ceremonial, all conflict between old and new, all desire for experiment for its own sake. Bad art and music, ignorance and error in teaching, lack of fellowship whether in the direction of unreality or of exclusiveness—these denote an unworthy conception of God, as Christ revealed Him, a failure to share and to transmit His Spirit. Neither the members of the Chapter, nor the congregations to whom they minister, agree in their ideas as to the means that best help them to worship. No one of us has a monopoly of the religious life; and none of us dare assume that what obviously helps his fellows can be swept aside. So out of the resources of the past, or where they are incomplete by tentative innovation, we can try to devise means appropriate to the end in view, testing each by its effects, and not hesitating to drop what fails to meet a need, or to extend and develop whatever has proved its worth. Thus we can welcome a daily Eucharist and daily lectures in the same Lady Chapel; services with a highly elaborate ceremonial and services of the starkest simplicity; devotions composed for a special occasion and the offices of the Book of Common Prayer; sermon-lectures

[1] cf. *The Eternal Spirit: An Account of the Congress,* published by Hodder & Stoughton, 2/6.

preceded by hymns and bidding prayer, and services of sacred music without spoken prayer or address.

To write this may seem to suggest a medley of anarchic incongruities, or at least that we have adopted the dangerous pragmatic doctrine that what meets a need is justified; that we are opening the door to sensationalism if not to superstition, and accepting the belief that where folks admittedly differ each can go his way, since there is no best except what is good for me. It is here, of course, that the fundamental importance of our ideal of God and of His service comes in: without it there would be chaos and the competition of incompatibles: with it there is ordered freedom, ordered not by the appeal to popularity whether this be witnessed by traditional usage or by the power to draw a crowd, but by the desire to make worship as beautiful, as truthful, as Christian as we can. 'How do you manage when a stranger takes a service like that?' said a great artist to me after one of the 'free' services at 8.30 on a Sunday. 'Don't you often have something rather terrible?' 'Only if he's insincere—or plays monkey tricks,' was the very obvious reply. 'The building by its dignity and beauty makes the congregation attentive and expectant, and welds them into a unity. Preachers and people find themselves in a community of worship. All he has to do is to realize God's presence.' 'You expressed something then that could not have been rendered by any other *technique*' said another artist after one of the great processions. 'I was under the shadow of the Cross' said a third at the conclusion of the special service with which the Church Congress closed.

The aesthetic test is perhaps the most compelling. The architect has given us a very exacting standard. In the presence of his work what is cheap or insincere, vulgar or theatrical, jars like a magenta petunia in a bed of red geraniums. Anyone who is sensitive to atmosphere feels at once the constraint and the inspiration; and the congregation feel it too. We have had certain complaints about the behaviour of our people—largely due to the fact that some of them are not church-goers and pray more readily sitting. I have never seen any single act of real irreverence, and almost none of carelessness. And with practically everyone the first entrance to the building means a thrill of awe and devotion.

Along with art there must be the test of truth. Christians have too long accepted the belief that there were two separate spheres of study—the natural order to which scientific methods could properly be applied, and the supernatural with which science had no concern. Such dualism offers a tempting means of escape to those whose faith is perplexed by new discovery, by the tendencies of certain students of biology and psychology. Plainly it opens the way not only to obscurantism and superstition, but to a conception of the universe irreconcilable alike with the example of Jesus and with the faith of Christendom. We cannot confine scientific method to what can be weighed and measured : we cannot remove religion from the influence of our conception of Nature. Truth is one : the best thought and experience of mankind, whether we label it scientific or theological, must be devoted to its exploration. The world is waiting for a synthetic interpretation of the nature and purpose of reality, which shall take into account the fullest knowledge available. For our generation after the enormous expansion of our outlook and the chaos following upon a time of unparalleled change, the need for such re-interpretation is of almost paramount importance. And in our Cathedral every detail of equipment or of rite must be tested by the question, ' does this convey a true and worthy expression of God? '

In the coming Lent we hope to conduct the whole of our services upon a plan designed to explain this conception in its various phases and in the simplest form. It is, I believe, at once Catholic in that it is true to the continuous experience and testimony of the Church, Evangelical as wholly Christ-centred and missionary, and Modernist in its thorough acceptance of revelation as a process, of authority as everywhere conditioned, of science as a means to the knowledge of God, of the fact that we live in the twentieth century, not in the thirteenth or the sixteenth, or even the late nineteenth. One of the first and most obvious developments of the work was the establishment of a Cathedral School of Theology where regular teaching on the Old and New Testaments, the Prayer Book and Creeds, the history of the Church and on the relation of Christianity to biology, psychology and philosophy could be given. We must test our worship with our minds.

Finally, there is the moral test. We exist to serve a great end, the coming of God's Kingdom in the diocese. Fellowship, love, communion with God and man—that is the simple translation of our purpose. Such fellowship must express and fulfil the whole true life of man, personal and corporate. Selfishness is always and everywhere its enemy. Conceptions of God which fall short of Christ; controversies between us which estrange and embitter; acquiescence in evil, private or social; pandering to ambition or to fear—these things which so often reveal themselves in Church organisation and worship have only to be recognized in order to be repudiated: they will not bear justification in the presence of God: we agree when we are on our knees. And our responsibility is not only for ourselves, but for the diocese. The Cathedral is the mother church: she must not interfere with or scandalise her daughters. This in itself provides a clear limit to our use of liberty. We cannot, for example, fix our evening service at 6.30: to do so would be to inflict hardship on neighbouring parishes. We cannot form Cathedral guilds or branches of societies on parochial lines: they would draw away from the parishes those who ought to be offering service in them. We must encourage and welcome all opportunities for civic or vocational services, for collective gatherings of diocesan organizations, for the celebration of local or national events: we are to help the diocese and every centre of population in it to realize itself as integral to God's plan and as united with the whole company of His people. And if this is to be attempted, nothing but the best is worth-while. Each service, small or great; each worker from the choir-boys and cleaners to the dean; each detail of equipment and of activity must be fit for God's use. Its beauty, its reasonableness, its moral worth must be tested by the best standards we can apply, as we would test our own souls.

This plainly means always that we must be alive, adapted to our environment, free to translate into the technique of to-day, the technique which the art and knowledge and ethics of to-day approve, the presence of the Eternal. Just as our Cathedral conforms to no previous type of architecture, so the conduct of its services, the content of its message, the ordering of its ceremonial, the choice of its music will never be dictated by the

desire to reproduce the style or habits of a period however august. If, for example, we are really satisfied that the State prayers represent the worthiest form of intercession, we shall use them: we shall not do so for any other reason whatsoever. This is not to say that tradition should be disregarded or rules of the Church neglected: it is to claim that the question which we ought to ask is not 'Is this customary?—or Catholic?—or Protestant?—or a useful experiment?' but 'Does this constitute the best means at our disposal for the worship of God?' Danger—yes, of course there is danger, here as in the whole art of living Christianly, not more and not less. Recognize the danger: pray—not necessarily in words: trust God and the brethren: and go forward.

And so far, though we have failed often and badly, though we have made many changes and shall continue to make them, we have received from the Church, from the diocese and from the city a generosity of kindness that has been more than wonderful. At the Consecration; at the First Synod; at the special services of Armistice; at innumerable other simple occasions the spirit of unity has been the same; and the sharing in it has enabled those of us, who heartily dislike much that has been done, to maintain fellowship, and if we criticize to criticize in love.

It would be interesting were it not somewhat ungracious to compare our work with that (say) of Chester, from which we have learned much both to copy and to avoid. The difference is due partly to the different character of the building. Our great open spaces do not lend themselves to the wealth of detailed enrichment which has been devoted, perhaps too lavishly, to the privacies of Chester. We are Catholic in appeal by reason of the mass effect of a tremendous and coherent unity, to which every detail is contributory. They by the provision of a multiplicity of special objects, each appealing to a particular type of worshipper; we feel this multiplicity destroys the sense of repose, of order, and proportion. But the contrast is more fundamental than this. In the admirable account of the function of a Cathedral by the Dean of Chester, there is no recognition of its duty as a centre of learning or of teaching. The needs of the aesthetic senses are stressed, the needs of the mind are passed over in

silence. It is not fanciful to say that by this omission he reveals a very wide divergence from our ideal. He takes knowledge for granted: we hold that the business of the Church also includes a duty to reveal and interpret what has been bequeathed by the intellectual labours of the past.

To us knowledge has to be sought out: we must explore and discover, that we may pray and work with the understanding as well as with the spirit. There is a real contrast between the conception which regards truth as a possession to be enjoyed and that for which it is a goal to be attained. The Church must at the same time take the utmost care to make provision for the worship which is assurance, as well as for the worship of aspiration and adventure. The revival of past methods fallen into disuse has received careful consideration, and we have learned much from them, but we are of the opinion that it is the duty of Churchmen who believe in ordered development to seek out the underlying principles of past methods and to let those principles express themselves in new modes suited to the quality and resources of the present: and here perhaps Liverpool, free to form its own tradition and aided by the achievement of its architect, may make a real contribution to the life of Christendom.

I have spoken chiefly of the purpose underlying the work of the Chapter, rather than of the means by which that purpose is being given shape. Our work could not be carried on were it not for the magnificent loyalty and co-operation of the clergy and laity of the diocese. Merely to name the various bodies of helpers will be to indicate our debt to them. The Cathedral Builders whose purpose is to complete the structure; the Ladies' Guild responsible for the supply of frontals, embroideries and linen, and for the care of the sanctuary; the Wardens and their helpers, the Stewards, chosen from the deaneries of the diocese; the College of Marshals; the College of Cantors who form the nucleus of a School of Sacred Music; the Synod Witnesses, a group of representative clergy who meet at the Cathedral to consider practical questions arising out of the business of the Synod of the clergy; the staff of the School of Theology with the lay lecturer, Dr. Burch; the Greater Chapter, the twenty-four Honorary Canons, two of whom work with the Canon in Residence every month; these, together with the Choir, Vergers

and Cleaners form a great fellowship united to make the Cathedral truly representative of the many-sided activities of the Church in its ministry to the people of South-West Lancashire.

THE OLDER ORTHODOXY

By the Rev. E. C. Bayliss, M.A.

'His dream was a return to early Christianity as it was before Councils had laid the minds of men in chains; a Christianity of practice, not of opinion, where the Church itself might consent to leave the intellect free to think as it pleased on the inscrutable mysteries; and where, as the Church would no longer insist on particular forms of belief, mankind would cease to hate and slaughter each other because they differed on points of metaphysics. In Luther he (Erasmus) saw the same disposition to dogmatic assertion at the opposite pole of thought; an intolerance of denial as dangerous as the churchman's intolerance of affirmation.'

J. A. Froude, *Life and Letters of Erasmus* (p. 213).

'THE objections of educated men to the popular theology do not lie any longer in the direction that they once lay. . . . What men want to know is, the character of the God they are asked to adore. Is He intrinsic goodness, or only an angry God, conciliated by an amazing sacrifice?'[1]

'A just jealousy, in a word, for the character of God—this must be our only safeguard against that evangelical legalism which creeps in, to steal away the hearts of men from the simplicity which is in Christ Jesus.'[2]

The simplicity which is in Christ Jesus. That is what men are seeking to-day. That is why organized religion seems to be a failure; that is why so many of our churches stand empty; men do not find in them and in their teachers the simplicity they seek.

There are probably more praying people in England to-day than ever before in her history. There are certainly more who try to love their neighbour. If the experience of the writer is to be trusted, it is almost impossible to travel in ship or train, or to mingle in any way with men and women, without meeting those who are anxious to talk of the things that matter. No Name, no teaching, quoted in conversation commands such instant, and on the whole reverent, attention as the Name and

[1] Heard's *Hulsean Lectures* (1892), p. 168. [2] *Ib.*, p. 46.

teaching of Jesus Christ. And the number of those who, half unconsciously, are influenced in their conduct by His life as recorded in the Gospels is beyond any statistics of religious bodies. Yet because they are not members of any religious communion, because they are sadly called 'unorthodox,' men wax pessimistic over the position of spiritual life in the country. Can we not find again that simplicity without becoming unorthodox, without 'unchurching' ourselves or others?

The Hulsean Lectures which I have quoted at the beginning of this paper will answer the question. They tell of an older orthodoxy than that of Roman Catholicism. The book was unfortunate in its title; *Alexandrian and Carthaginian Theology Contrasted* is a title which would scarcely befit a 'best-seller' in an age which the present Archbishop of Canterbury once called an age of 'spoon-meat.' Yet it, and its predecessor, *Old and New Theology*, might almost be called thrilling in their presentment of a theology which commends itself to the present time, as it did to the Church of the first four centuries. For, as we find in the Hulseans, 'if we lay our appeal to the fathers of the oldest theology, that of Alexandria and Antioch, then we claim to be orthodox old Catholics. Singular as it may seem, it is the oldest and the newest theologies which harmonize best' (p. 80). And again: 'What savours of heresy is instead Catholic, if we take that vague term in its simple first sense,[3] as the theology of the undivided Church down to Athanasius' (p. 214).

My object in this paper is, not to set forth my own views on theology, but to summarize the teaching contained in these Hulsean Lectures, and then to ask a question. The lecturer begins by dividing theological thinking into two types; the first thoughts of God, and the afterthoughts of men. 'The first thoughts of God come with authority to the conscience. Man's afterthoughts lack this true note of authority, and they make up for it by the mock thunder of dogmatism. They are positive where revelation is silent' (pp. 2-4). 'No truth deserves to be called a revelation which is not commended to the conscience. By this touchstone we test it' (p. 136).

[3] Catholic in its 'first sense' meant *universal*, in contrast to *local*, as in St. Ignatius' aphorism: 'Where the bishop is there the Church is; where Christ is there is the Catholic Church.'—Ed., *M.C.*

'By the time of Theodosius the persecuted Church became the persecuting, nor have we far to seek the explanation. As soon as creed fossilizes into Dogma, what before was Conviction passes away into Conformity. It calls for no inward act of spiritual verification' (p. 151).

Later, the lecturer goes on to say that religion belongs in essence to the region of the affections rather than to that of the intellect; and that its removal from the private conscience to the decision of the Church goes far to explain all that we mean by afterthoughts. 'The Alexandrian point of departure was the general Fatherhood of God' (p. 206). 'Sovereignty, in a word, is not the right concept with which to approach God. If we, being evil, know how to give good gifts to our children, we do not set out by training them to fear us. On the contrary, all true parentage creates the sense of fondness by familiarity, and goes on to chasten the child only to purge out those base qualities which hinder sonship. The Fatherhood of God, based on the analogy of earthly fatherhood, is the true key to any theology worthy of the name.' And again, 'The true basis of man's spiritual nature lies in the thought that he is the son of God, though the sense of sonship has been forgotten. For this reason a revelation is more than possible, it is probable' (p. 99). Here we come upon the contrast between Augustinian and Alexandrian theology. 'Augustine sets out with man as a fallen guilty rebel, not so much as a child of God. To forgive him freely might be the fatherly instinct of God, but these Latin theologians, steeped in Roman law, saw that there must be equivalence of punishment before the claims of justice could be discharged. Out of all this grew the theories of the Atonement' (p. 79).

If man is the child of God, his Father has not left Himself without witness. 'The Eternal was from eternity immanent in the universe, and has manifested Himself in time under three stages as Light, as Life, as Love. It is at the last and highest stage that He breaks into consciousness as the intelligent and spiritual agent, revealing Himself to man by that which in the early Hebrew record is said to be the Voice of the Lord' (p. 62).

Again and again the lecturer returns to the note of Simplicity. Simplicity, he says, is the first note of a true theology. The next is that all turns on the Person of Christ. He thinks of

Christ with no uncertainty. To him, as to St. John, He is tha Logos through whom there came to the world the self-manifes tation of the Father. 'To Athanasius and his school, this wa a vital conception.' The Alexandrian, 'setting out with th assumption that God's purpose was the education of the whol human family, saw in the Logos doctrine of St. John the key t harmonize all truth. The doctrine of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost made up the entire circle of Christian teaching in Alex andria' (p. 39).

And this Logos doctrine is the explanation of the enigma o creation, the bridge over the gulf between the Infinite and th Finite. 'With a Deity immanent in all His works in an through the Logos, all proceeds in orderly evolution.' (p. 215).

It is at this point that we come upon the only appearance o confusion of thought which Mr. Heard displays. It is a littl difficult to see how he distinguishes between the Logos and th Holy Spirit. It may be that the same distinction puzzled th Alexandrian teachers. What Mr. Heard says is this. 'The Kenosis which is the key to the Incarnation is the key to ou conception of God in creation. He is ever communicating through the Son some of His perfections to those lower order of being whom we call His creatures, as the sun sheds hi beams into space. Kenosis then suggests the key to the self effacement of the Divine in a human consciousness. But it goe further than this; it implies that He emptied Himself of Hi Glory. It is the same Logos who is the link in creation betwee the Finite and the Infinite, who has become one flesh with us that we may become one spirit with Him, and Who is the on fountain of inspiration. The wisdom and goodness of th Logos dwelt in the Man Christ Jesus. In Him was the indwell ing of the Holy Ghost, not given to Him by measure as to th other sons of men. But this does not imply either omniscienc or omnipotence. These are attributes of pure Deity, which wer laid aside when He emptied Himself of His glory' (p. 267).

And from this teaching, as naturally as fruit from seed there comes belief in continuous inspiration and continuou miracle. 'Holy men of old were inspired, not magically, bu because they were holy men. Such inspiration has never cease in the Church. . . . Inspiration, like miracles, is continuous an

constant, though we still look back, and not forward, for both' (p. 12). The lecturer explains, later in his book, how the Reformers set up a theory of book-inspiration to combat Church Authority. They were afraid to acknowledge such a purely spiritual principle as the inner light of the conscience, upon which the theology of Alexandria, and, it is to be hoped, the theology of our future, will be founded. Students of what is called 'comparative religion' have begun to acknowledge that something very like inspiration is to be found in non-Christian religious systems. 'But the Hellenist would have thought it treason, to Him Who is Lord of the spirits of all flesh, to deny that His Spirit has been everywhere stirring the thoughts of men.' So writes Dr. Thomas Allin in his book *Race and Religion*, a book which sums up, even better than the work of Mr. Heard, that 'Older Orthodoxy' which is the subject of this paper.

And if the Alexandrian rejoiced to believe that inspiration extended to the heathen seekers after God, so, with St. Paul, he held that the Gentiles were in all things 'fellow-heirs, and one body in Christ.'

And side by side with belief in the Holy Spirit's mission to all mankind, we find the belief in a salvation as extensive. Hellenism was optimistic. 'In proportion to the eminence of any Christian teacher was the conviction with which he asserted the termination of penalties at some time in the future' (Allin, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7). Probably most people, brought up in Western modes of thought, look on the punishment of sin as something to be faced in the future. But to the Hellenist, sin and its punishment were one and indivisible. They saw that evil is a quality of the free-will of man. 'It is an awful endowment of his nature, that it can so determine its destiny for eternity' (Heard, p. 306). Sin is self-hood; which fact has been overlooked 'on account of the horrible distortion describing sin as an infinite offence against an infinite Being, and so deserving an infinite punishment. No one seemed to see that . . . sin is finite, because it is the act of a finite being' (Heard, p. 184). And more; the Greek type of theology held that there is an increasing purpose running through man's story, elevating him by slow degrees, as geology reminds us that the evolution up-

ward of organic life has been slow, constant, and continuous. 'The crude theory of the Fall is out of harmony with science and irreconcilable with sound conceptions of an unchangeable God' (Heard, p. 167).

It is impossible, within the limits of such a paper as this, to touch on all the points which challenge attention in these Lectures. The lecturer's arch-enemy is dogmatism. He measures the decline of a Christian communion from primitive truth by its dogmatic theology. Just as he sees spiritual despotism as the characteristic sin of churchmen, so over-definition is the vice of theology.

'Doctrine spring from life and its needs; dogma sets out by distinguishing between faith and conduct. It confines faith almost entirely to the intellectual side of life.' And later, 'What we know of God by the Voice within must be far more certain than the deductions of a so-called logic. The majority of divines hold their dogmatic theology as regulative truth only. They are thankful to Dean Mansel for inventing a phrase by which they can escape from their own conclusions. In the case of the lay world, they dilute their theology with what they call common-sense, and hold as much or as little of it as does not shock their instinct of right and wrong. But trained theologians have no such escape' (p. 250).

It is that Inner Light which mediates between God and the Man. And as faithful life goes on, the Light grows brighter. 'Those who see as far as St. Paul did into the mind of God, see that the mind of Christ must be an attainment only to be reached at the end of a lifetime. To be baptized into Christ as a formula is one thing; to drink of the cup which He drank, and to be baptized with His baptism is quite another' (p. 114).

And from the Hellenistic belief in the world-wide influence of the Spirit of God, there follows belief in a Church which is potentially co-extensive with the whole race of man, because Christ is at once the Head of the Church and of all humanity. 'It is impossible not to recognize, if not formally, yet indirectly, as fellow-Churchmen, all in whose life the Spirit of Christ is working' (Allin, p. 32).

What encouragement in struggle, and what breadth of sympathy, is in these two thoughts!

One cannot leave this book without touching on the quiet humour, as well as the uncommon boldness, which enlivens the argument. And every now and then one comes upon illustrations of a rare felicity. Just one example. 'Who now speaks of colour as an entity? So far from colour being a quality, it is only the result of the action of light on certain bodies, whereby they absorb some and reject others of the rays of the spectrum. Colour is the rejected matter of sunbeam. May it not be so in theology? Sin is, like death, a condition or relation of a moral agent to himself and others. As colour is only a modification of light, so evil is the result of the repulsion of God's light on certain of His moral agents. All the shades of right and wrong are only the action and reaction of Law and Desire, Flesh and Spirit, on each other. Evil would cease and disappear if either of the conditions which keep man midway between an angel and an animal were to cease' (p. 323).

There are obvious faults in Heard's Hulsean Lectures, as in his other works. There has been careless proof-reading. There is a certain diffuseness which sometimes makes the argument difficult to follow. There is repetition of points already driven home. But when every adverse criticism has been made, the reader of these books is introduced to a theology which will commend itself to the conscience and to the reason of all who believe in God at all.

Early in this article I said that it was my purpose to ask a question. This is the question: 'Do these works, of Mr. Heard and of Dr. Allin, truly expound the theology which was held during the first four centuries of the Christian Church?' If they do, then Modernism, so-called, is in reality the Older Orthodoxy; and we have in it a theology which can be the guide and inspiration of life to the learned and the simple alike; which will lead men back to the Simplicity which is in Christ Jesus.

'Bewildered in its search, bewildered with the cry
"Lo here, lo there the Church," poor sad Humanity
Through all the dust and heat turns back with bleeding feet
By the weary road it came,
Unto the simple thought by the Great Master taught,
And that remaineth still:
"Not he that repeateth the Name,
But he that doeth the Will."'

BOOK REVIEWS

FROM A VICTORIAN POST BAG*

This post bag containing letters of Victorian celebrities written to a Modernist before the days of Modern Churchmen, throws many interesting side-lights upon questions still of moment.

Dr. Llewellyn Davies held a unique position of influence in Victorian days and after—as a distinguished scholar, an advanced Social Reformer, an Erastian State-churchman, and, above all, the disciple and exponent of Maurice (the Prophet). All sorts of well-known people came into contact with him and sought his opinion, or expressed their views to him, as a glance at this correspondence, for which we are indebted to his son for publication, shows.

Carlyle leads off with a letter dated 1850: 'In these days it will behove both old and young (and it is rather a sad task when laid so much upon the young) to prove all things and hold fast by that which is good.'

In another letter he refers to Llewellyn Davies's translation of Plato's Republic: 'The divine Plato is always welcome to me, though hitherto rather useless, try him on what side I may—high and radiant and classically graceful always, but very unsubstantial: a beautiful Zodiacal light, which is almost of no service for showing your road, alas!'

And further: 'We of this nation have indeed got into deep sloughs of disgraceful confusion—and infinitely deeper lie ahead, I doubt not, unless we bethink ourselves in time . . . Looking back to what we once were, and round to what we are: to what the Ancestral Heroisms and beneficial Providences have done for us, and what we have, in the last two centuries, done for ourselves, in the train of all that—I often think we have a really terrible account to settle with the Supreme Powers.'

Ruskin writes under date 1862. 'I have been seldom happy in these last years, but was made so to-day, by hearing some details of this grand deed of the Bishop of Natal (Colenso). Trumpet of true battle blown at last.'

He follows on with his 'deliberate and stern conviction that the form in which Christianity is at present preached in England is the most fatal cause of human crime and suffering now extant on the earth. Most fatal because poisoning the most vital of the earth's powers and the most richly delegated of Heaven's.'

J. R. Seeley in a full letter complains with reference to the criticism of *Ecce Homo* as to his giving up the 'ancient faith.' 'I am angry with the modern faith because it differs from the ancient; that, in fact, I do not cling to the modern faith, but do cling to the ancient.'

There are several letters from his constant friend, *Tom Hughes,* in one of which, in reference to his expounding Maurice's prophetic works, he adds: 'You see that, though Maurice's mantle brings with it no mundane emoluments, it carries certain responsibilities, which in this case I know you will not grudge undertaking.' And further: 'We look to you to supplement Maurice, and to put the truths he hasn't been able to make clear, except to sympathetic people, in such a form that no honest mind can

**From a Victorian Post Bag,* being letters addressed to Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies by Thomas Carlyle and others. (Peter Davies, Ltd., London. 1926. 1/- net.)

doubt what is meant. If we are to save the Established Church, it will only be done by such teaching.'

Then there appear a few letters from *Maurice* himself, but only those that have not been already published elsewhere.

Of Ruskin he writes: 'I was much touched with what you say about Ruskin; anything which makes him doubt his own infallibility will, I am sure, do him good. He is earnest, I am convinced, and will "come right."'

About the Colenso controversy: 'The pain which Colenso's book has caused me is more than I can tell you. I used nearly your words, "It is the most purely negative criticism I have ever read," in writing of him. He seems to imagine himself a great critic and discoverer; and I am afraid he has met with an encouragement which will do him unspeakable mischief.'

And on Comtists: 'I would fain show that the basis which they reject is the only possible one for the Humanity which they worship to rest on. If Christianity is not an assertion of the divine Humanity, as the ground of our morality, what is it?'

Herbert Spencer acknowledging a sermon to Jews, 1884, says: 'I would remark in respect to it that you, I think, represent a much greater difference between Huxley and myself than exists. To the best of my belief Huxley accepts the doctrine of the genesis of moral intuitions by the inherited effects of experiences; and I, just as much as he, hold that feeling, and not reason, is the operative agent.'

In turning to the letters of *Charles Kingsley* we find him writing: 'Maurice's Essays, as you say, will constitute an epoch . . . If the Church of England rejects them, her doom is fixed . . . She will rot and die, as the Alexandrian did before her. If she accepts them—not as a "code complet," but as hints toward a new method of thought, she may save herself still.'

And, asserting the right of any clergyman to write about Biblical criticism, he says: 'I will attack, if need be, anyone who, while using criticism ignores vital religion—which with me is synonymous with a belief in the main facts of the Bible. If they are taken away, I have no alternative but Emerson, whom I do not believe in; or to turn a jolly Greek Pagan again—which I am more inclined to do, but do not, on the whole, think it would wash.'

From the letter of *Bishop Westcott*, the one episcopal correspondent, the following is noteworthy: 'I had occasion to look through the New Testament a year or two ago to collect all traces of organization (of a permanent Constitution for the Church) ,and was almost startled by the clearness of the result. Just now no one seems to look further back than the twelfth century. The Catholic Church, as I understand, began then. It is all most sad.'

Passing others, one affectionate tribute must be given from *Dr. Edwin Abbott*, who writes with reference to the dedication of one of his books to J. Ll. Davies: 'I should very much like to dedicate them to you, not only because of other reasons, but because you first brought me out of Christianity to Christ, so that I feel that, whatever apprehension of Christ I may have, I am indebted for it to you more than to any other man.'

Dean Farrar, among many suggestions in 1868, writes: 'It has often occurred to me that there is one permanent and inestimable service which Liberal clergymen might now perform: and that is to publish a clear, calm, fearless and honest commentary—of the briefest character—on the Old Testament. An Edition of Genesis might be first printed tentatively. It

might contain the text—correcting the translation where necessary; it might dwell only on real difficulties or points which become clearer by good illustration; it might lay down firmly, but in a calm and conciliatory way and constructively rather than controversially, the principles which guide us in dealing with Biblical interpretation.'

Phillips Brooks writes in reference to *Order and Growth* (the Hulsean Lectures of 1890): 'I have long been your pupil with reference to those relations of Christianity to the larger life of man, which have entailed your thought and study. And these new pages have much which interests me very deeply, and which I shall hope to read with greater attention than I have yet been able to bestow. I am sure that the more carefully I read them, the more I shall thank you for writing them.'

Passing by the notes of Dean Stanley, Robert Browning and Matthew Arnold, which are included, the review may fitly conclude with lines sent at a time of sorrow by Professor J. E. B. Mayor:

'Comes to thee pain, then hold thee still,
Search meekly what it of thee will;
Eternal Love ne'er deals a blow
That human tears in vain may flow.'

H. J. Palmer,
Hon. Canon of Ripon.

THE MIGRATION OF SYMBOLS.*

The word symbol is used in a very vague and unsatisfactory way. That is to say, it is used often in connections in which it is not the right word, though the right word is hard to find. In common parlance symbol is used in the sense of 'something that stands for, represents, or denotes something else' (Murray). Murray explains that it stands for something else, 'not by exact resemblance, but by vague suggestion, or by some accidental or conventional relation.' A staff or a key, for instance, is said to stand for 'authority'; blood or wine is said to stand for 'life'; barley, rice or a shell is said to stand for 'fertility.' Little or no distinction is made in the ages or periods to which symbols belong. Little or no account is taken of the history or evolution of these so-called symbols. In accounts of magical and religious rites we hear of things like barley-bread, resin and jade being eaten; and of things like blood, wine and beer, often coloured red, being drunk; and they are said to be symbols. Were things that people ate and drank in this connection thought of originally as symbols? This is a question which is seldom asked.

The fact seems to be that in certain phases of magic and religion things, which have been, and are still, described as symbols for power of one kind or another, were at first not strictly symbols at all. They did not symbolize power, but were regarded as powers in themselves. They were held to be things possessed of life-stuff or instruments of life. If we find them associated closely with a deity, they were not emblems or symbols of the deity, as is commonly supposed, but rather appurtenances or concomitants of the deity. They became real emblems or symbols only in the course of a long development, only when belief in the things as vital powers in themselves had given place to belief in them as representing ideas potent to promote various kinds of vitality.

**The Migration of Symbols: Their relations to Beliefs and Customs.* By Donald A. Mackenzie. (Kegan. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. 1926. Pp. xvi+219. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.)

In higher religion things which seem to have stood originally for something quite concrete have come to stand for something purely abstract. If this be so, the history of all those things which have come to be described as symbols is important for the correct interpretation of real symbolism. Symbolism is a kind of picture language in which the pictures have to be studied historically and scientifically like hieroglyphs. When we speak of blood and wine and barley and bread without discrimination as symbols both in the religion of the ancient Egyptians and in primitive and modern Christianity we are continuing to confuse things which, in early times, were subject to confusion, but which are more or less distinct. This is true even of the Cross, which is very much older than Christianity. The ancient Egyptian key of life was a cross. It was not merely a symbol of life, but an instrument which was supposed to impart life. The Christian cross was never a thing of this kind. Nor was it a symbol at first, any more than the ancient Egyptian key of life was. It was a painful historical fact, a real instrument, not of life but of death. When it became a Christian symbol it gathered round it ideas of life as well as ideas of death. In early Syriac literature it is called 'the sign of life,' just as the ancient Egyptian key of life was called 'the sign of life.' The Christian cross thus acquired a symbolism which interpreted the essential meaning of Christianity better than did the historical cross of Calvary. And in Christianity the cross became a pure symbol, whereas in the ancient Egyptian religion it was thought of as a concrete instrument possessed of a magical potency.

There is no harm in symbols so long as we realise fully that they are symbols and nothing more. Indeed, rightly understood, they serve a useful purpose. If we do not understand them rightly we retard the progress of spiritual religion and give the enemy occasion to blaspheme.

Mr. Donald A. Mackenzie, in his recently-published volume on *The Migration of Symbols,* makes no pretence of giving us a comprehensive treatment of symbolism. His field is intentionally limited. He concerns himself with the Swastika, the Spiral, Ear-symbols and Tree-symbols. His book would have been more useful to the ordinary student of symbolism if he had added a summary of his results and a bibliography. Since he deals incidentally with the navel of the earth, and more than incidentally with tree symbols, a reference might have been given somewhere to Dr. A. J. Wensinck's treatises, which do not seem to be as well known as they deserve to be. But the book, like other books by the same author, reveals a remarkable knowledge of mythology and folklore. More important still, it demonstrates to the reader that the subject is one which is capable of historical and scientific treatment. In this respect Mr. Mackenzie is, and has for some years been, among the pioneers. Symbolism needs to be handled along the lines indicated, and not as a kind of plaything. The many plates and illustrations which adorn the book are particularly good and illuminating. MAURICE A. CANNEY.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM.*

No one can read this book without profit, provided he reads with care. In a brief account of so large a subject as a religious standpoint a writer will necessarily throw his emphasis on one or two topics and leave the rest in partial neglect. Canon Lacey has chosen for emphasis polity—the

**The Faiths. The Anglo-Catholic Faith.* By T. A. Lacey, D.D., Canon of Worcester. xvii+185 pp. (London: Methuen and Co. 5/-. 1926.)

Church as sovereignty, the source and method of its authority. He has done so because he believes that in polity the essential Anglo-Catholicism is found. Anglo-Catholic theology he hardly notices. Anglo-Catholic worship he is inclined to criticize. He speaks almost with contempt of spurious medievalism and disputes about dress. He regrets the substitution of the early Eucharist for the traditional communion after Mattins. He gives some notes on Fasting and Penance, instructive and decidedly critical of prevalent ideas, some Anglo-Catholic, some not. Fasting has so lost its meaning that not only has it become in pious circles synonymous with abstinence from anything except food, but 'the climax of absurdity has perhaps been reached in the announcement of a "special service of prayer and fasting from twelve to one o'clock"' (p. 159).

Dr. Lacey's essential exposition of his subject however rests on polity. Anglo-Catholicism is a sect, that is, 'a temporary association of the like-minded' (p. 182). It is not a permanent association, nor need it be supposed to possess a final message. Its object is to diffuse Catholicity. 'Catholicity is the religious quality of temper which makes Christianity universal. Any group of Christians, local or diffused, who are led by circumstances to exhibit that temper in a marked degree may reasonably be distinguished as catholic in contrast with others in whom it is less evident.' This temper is not, as the definition must suggest to the ordinary person, that Christian ethos imperfectly represented by the word charity. For Anglo-Catholicism the issue is not primarily social or ethical, it is political (as Aristotle uses the word political). Catholicity then reveals itself as the habit of appealing to the Catholic Church. If it be asked where exactly that Catholic Church is to be found, the answer is that it is equivalent to the unity achieved and preserved in the episcopate. Wherever there is a bishop with a flock, there is the Catholic Church, a living organism. In time and place this authority may be sectional and so defective. This appears to mean that in particular parts of Christendom at various times bishops and their flocks have practised error and thought amiss. Hence the true mind of the Church, and *ex hypothesi* the true Catholic temper, will be sought and found in the faith and practice not of a section but of the whole. Dangerous error will be condemned by the collected judgment of the whole Church. Sectional action of one part of the Church against another is to be deprecated and sectional error may be left alone. 'Anglo-Catholics cannot accept any doctrinal definition of the Church of England alone as an ultimate standard of orthodoxy; they must relate it to the controlling authority of the Catholic Church as a whole' (p. 113). The sting however is drawn from this by the qualification that it is necessary to contradict Catholic teaching and not merely diverge from it before the situation becomes intolerable.

On the political side the practical outcome of this theory is to claim for the Anglican Church a complete independencee of the English State, which logically should issue in Disestablishment. This last point however Dr. Lacey has modified in his Preface in deference to the recent Report of the Archbishops' Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, which he considers recognizes a separation of Church and State without disestablishment. In any case, Church and State are separate societies. Neither has domination over the other. They should co-operate voluntarily.

On the ecclesiastical side the emphasis clearly lies on the episcopate. 'The Catholic Church is at once a multitude of believers and a single organism. In the multitude each bishop is one, and no more; in the organism the bishops jointly are preponderant' (p. 85).

It is hardly necessary to say that this authoritative statement by Dr. Lacey is of enormous importance. For it is exactly here rather than on details of worship that many of us dissent most profoundly from the Anglo-Catholic position. There are two concepts, (1) of the Church as a Sovereign State, parallel to and independent of the secular State, that is the principle of Dual Control covering the whole field of life, and (2) that of the quasi-sovereign authority of the episcopate in the Ecclesiastical State. The first point is too large for discussion. It must suffice to say that the recent history of the Roman Communion has not been encouraging to those who rally to this doctrine. The second point is both more and less interesting. The mind of the Church is to be found in the episcopate. I infer (perhaps incorrectly) from another passage (p. 176) that in experience as contrasted with analysis the episcopate becomes equivalent to actual bishops. The argument implies that the bishop functions co-ordinately with his fellows and predecessors. But in actual fact he may act as he likes. The Church on this view is pure autocracy, or at best pure aristocracy. It has been said so often (not in this book) as to arouse suspicion that the Church is not a democracy. But is it so undemocratic as all that? Remiro de Martzu in *Authority, Liberty, and Function,* refers to the oath taken by the nobles to the ancient kings of Aragon, in which they declared, We who separately are your equals and together your superiors. A similar theory of Sovereignty can be sustained in the Church. By bishop and by priest the undemocratic *rôle* has been filled so disastrously that it is difficult to believe that the underlying theory can have much of a future in England. And when Dr. Lacey says that most Anglo-Catholics take only a tepid interest in the National Church Assembly, it is hardly an unfair inference that it is in some measure because their theory of the Church denies a real authority to the lay Christian.

The theory of Anglo-Catholicism can be discussed with perfect detachment. Unhappily practical issues confront us who are out in the open field. There we see all the puerilities that Dr. Lacey deprecates, the priest playing the village Pope, and all the types and performances catalogued in Mr. Compton Mackenzie's novels. A theory like that which Dr. Lacey puts before us, the theory of an aristocratic Church polity, in the hands of the wise may produce results of high excellence, but it is also just the theory that has the greatest power of attracting the dreadful type of manhood who keeps saying *J'y suis, j'y reste,* under the impression that he is the strong patient bearer of his Master's burden.

E. J. Martin.

GOD AND THE MACHINE.*

The mechanical or mechanistic view of the universe, which regards Nature as a vast self-acting machine, has usually been taken to involve atheistic consequences. Hence vigorous efforts on the part of religious thinkers to resist any such view, and especially to repel its invasion on the spheres of life and mind. It is notorious, however, that the younger school of biologists is predominantly mechanistic in outlook; and this applies also to physiology, neurology and psychology.

In view of this, it is interesting to find a distinguished philosopher turning the tables by maintaining that mechanism, far from proving the absence of mind, is the surest indication of its presence. Certainly this is

**Personality and Reality.* By J. E. Turner, M.A., Ph.D. George Allen and Unwin. 7/6 net.)

so in the case of human-made machines, which are devised by intelligence for a specific purpose; we make our environment more subject to control by devising machines—'arranging physical objects into mechanisms.'

One noticeable feature in human-made machines is that they tend to 'evolve.' One invention makes a new invention possible, one thing leads to another, and complexity increases by geometrical progression. Mechanism is evolutional in its very nature.

This tendency to a progressive complexity on the part of machines has a curious consequence. Complexity tends to outstrip comprehension. The originating mind can understand the machine, and realises the dependence of the machine upon the mind that has invented it; but for other minds, since increasing complexity also means increasing automatism, the machine either seems self-explanatory or utterly mysterious. It tends to 'conceal the originating mind from the discernment of all other minds that are yet far removed from its own degree of development.' The higher the inventive mind, the higher the automatism of the mechanism it invents, and the less obvious becomes the existence and activity of the inventive mind. The mechanism seems self-explanatory.

The trend of the argument will now have become clear. The entire physical universe seems to us a vast and self-acting mechanism. Its complexity is beyond human comprehension and its automatism flawless. Mind seems to be absent; we have no need of that hypothesis. But, just where mind has become indiscernible, here it becomes (according to this argument) reasonable to assume its presence, for the universal mechanism is, in reality, 'related to a dominant mind of a correlatively high order, which is, however, absolutely concealed by the very mechanism itself.'

Thus to outflank scientific naturalism by accepting its primary postulate of universal mechanism is a bold expedient, but may prove an effective one. But we welcome the book because it is an attempt to think out the real idea of mechanism, what it means and what it implies. People talk about the mechanical view of nature without pausing to inquire what they mean by a mechanism, or what the existence of a mechanism implies. Lotze probably got pretty near the facts of the case when he pointed out how absolutely universal is the extent, and at the same time how subordinate is the significance of mechanism in the scheme of things. After all, if the material universe were not rigidly mechanical, we should find it very difficult to deal with. And the more mechanical we can make it, the more easily can we impose our will upon it, this is the secret of our recent advances. We understand and manipulate the mechanics of nature so well that we have enslaved her, or are in the process of doing so. The danger is that with our new-found powers we may destroy ourselves; but this is to stray from the subject. We have to thank Dr. Turner for an original and suggestive book. J.C.H.

CHURCH MUSIC.*

Sir W. H. Hadow's little book on Church Music is an excellent addition to recent literature on the subject which testifies to an ever-increasing interest.

The author presents the reader with a clear and brief survey of the history of Church Music and diagnoses three diseases with which it is threatened—'Virtuosity, Theatricalism, and Sentimentalism.' Although the Archbishops' Committee, appointed in May 1922 'to consider and

**Church Music.* By Sir W. H. Hadow. (Longmans, Green and Co. 2/6 net. 1926.)

report upon the place of music in the worship of the Church ' has indirectly done a good deal to rid us of all three diseases, there are still many obvious indications that they are not yet stamped out. But to descend from generalities to particulars. Not the least important of these is the question of the voluntary before the service. Of this Vice-Chancellor Hadow writes :

> ' In many country churches . . . the player hastens from the vestry to the organ-stool, is allowed wholly insufficient time to play even one of the chorals of Bach or Brahms . . . If he venture to perform a set piece at all he is required to stop in the middle of a bar.'

But these lamentable practices are not confined to country churches. We know of a large Parish Church, famed for its musical traditions, where it is almost customary for the organist to enter the organ console and commence a weedy extemporization about two minutes before the Precentor arrives to announce what is invariably, but wrongly, called the Processional Hymn. Rather than ' setting worshippers in tune for the whole service ' such practices usually succeed in setting the nerves of such of the worshippers as are gifted with any sense of the aesthetic completely on edge.

With regard to the Holy Communion office, we are happy to note that Vice-Chancellor Hadow considers there is ' no finer setting of the Nicene Creed than that by Merbecke ' (not the ' Stainerized ' version of course !). There are also one or two modern modal settings to which we are sorry the author does not refer, but which are certainly worthy of consideration by the organist of the average parish choir. Among these we would particularly recommend the modal setting of Martin Shaw and also his arrangement of Merbecke, both published by Curwen.

Organists and clergy who have at heart the interests of congregation as well as choir will do well to read this little book, and seriously to consider the many interesting points raised by its author.

H. H. B.

ST. PAUL AND THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM.*

It may surprise us to find a book which is a distinct asset to English theology coming from the author of ' The Catholic Revival in the Church of England.' But the unexpected happens ; and Mr. Knox's *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* is a scholarly and suggestive treatise, so scientific in temper that it might have come from a German theologian. The arrangement of the chapters, each of which is followed by a lengthy series of notes, makes the book somewhat unwieldy. But its interest is such as to make the reader lose sight of minor inconveniences ; and once taken up, it is not easily put down. It is in substance a study of the life of St. Paul during that period of his career in which he was brought into contact—perhaps the more proper word would be conflict—with the original Christian community of Jerusalem. The writer has reconstructed the course of events, their causes and consequences, as he conceives them to have happened. The method is critical, and is based on the scientific use of the imagination. To the objection that such a method is arbitrary, the answer is that by no other can intelligible results be obtained. A comparison between Mr. Knox's conclusions and those of F. C. Baur suggests itself. Baur was a pioneer, and, as pioneers will, over-accentuated the note which he had been the first to strike. But it was the keynote to the interpretation of the

* *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem.* By the Rev. Wilfred L. Knox. (Pub. Cambridge University Press, 1925. 18/-.)

sources; and the reaction against the Tübingen school, like all reactions has been carried a great deal too far.

The strife of Antioch was the most important event in Church history We have only St. Paul's account of it; we cannot doubt that those 'o Cephas' represented it in another light. Man of genius as he was, th Apostle of the Gentiles was an uncomfortable colleague. He was 'all man kind's epitome': tempestuous, temperamental, self-assertive—no one knev what he would say or do next. The bishops of to-day claim to be the suc cessors of the Apostles. If they are, it is with a difference; and St. Pau must be written off their pedigree. Never was anyone so unlike a bishop so extreme, so tactless, so intemperate. Mr. Knox speaks of his 'mili tant fanaticism,' his 'autocratic methods,' his 'astounding fluctuations o temperament,' and of 'the violence both of his hatreds and his enthu siasms,' in terms which recall Jowett's subacid saying that the Apostl 'must have been very unlike a good man of our own time.' And hi criticism of the text is as radical as his judgment on persons is drastic.

> 'The first point which strikes us, when the original Marcan narra tive is compared with the later editions of it, is the intensification o the miraculous element.'

In such crucial passages as those which record the Transfiguration an the Resurrection the later accounts 'show clear traces of expansion t harmonize it with the beliefs of the primitive Church.' Again

> 'Nothing is so striking in the narrative of the Acts as the varia tions in the titles by which our Lord is referred to. It can hardly b doubted that in this respect St. Luke has accurately reproduced th practice of a period which was not interested in dogmatic accuracy a to the nature of His personality.'

That neither the Jews nor the original Jewish Christians were willing t jettison the Law need not surprise us. The Law was the national preroga tive of Israel: to ask a Jew to agree to its abrogation was like asking Catholic to throw over the Papacy: the one was what the other still is, centre of political and religious sentiment. In the case of the Mosaic Law its attraction for 'them which were without' was great and increasing. Ha Christianity not passed over into Catholicism, and become part and parce of the Empire, Judaism might have become the world religion and stiffene into a world-church. We may rejoice that this was not so. But, if th gods favoured what turned out to be the stronger of the two forces, thos who, like Cato, held to the weaker had a case not to be despised. Anti nomianism was the shadow cast by Pauline Christianity. To the Hebrev conscience the Law presented itself as a barrier not lightly to be dispense with against the moral corruptions of the Gentile world.

Second only to the strife of Antioch, as a key to the Apostolic age, wa the strife of Corinth. The judicious reader of the Epistle to the Galatian and of the two Epistles to the Corinthians has a map of the country which if honestly consulted, will keep him from going far astray. He could hav none better than that with which Mr. Knox provides him. And, if th Apostolic Church is scarcely the City of Peace which it has been pictured we must fit theory to fact, not fact to theory: 'things are what they are. The Appendix on the Primitive Eucharist calls for special notice. It is onl by a free use of the theory of Development that either the Catholic Mass o the Protestant Communion can be brought into relation with the earlie rite.

A.F.

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.*

These two books supplement each other and should be read together. It would not be strictly accurate to say that one deals with the theory and the other with the practical problems of education, but at least that suggests roughly the categories into which they fall. Mr. Thomson is concerned chiefly with the problem of the divorce between education and religion. The question does not concern the control of education by the Church, but the problem of how to secure an education which is in the fullest sense Christian. This is often made difficult from the start by a theory of human depravity which regards the child as incapable of vital religion : but, taking as the basis of his theme 'the essential religious-ness of child-nature,' the writer shows that the aim of education should be 'to promote growth and to foster development' (p. 29). Hence the importance of personal contact not only between teacher and child, but also between children of different abilities. Speaking of the results of the 'companionship of a diligent learner,' Mr. Thomson says : 'If adults think they can influence the young more than the young influence each other, they imagine a vain thing' (p. 40). Education, therefore, is a social process ; and the writer stresses the importance of giving the child a more active part in the fellowship of the Church's worship.

The other book is a fascinating study of the methods and difficulties of religious instruction, and it should be read by Sunday-School and Day-School teachers alike. Dr. Wodehouse is very frank and does not shelve difficulties ; her criticisms, therefore, are always to the point. 'We must study our subject, and prepare our classes and prepare our syllabus and then prepare our lessons,' she writes, and in expounding this she gives more helpful and practical advice than we have met in many a book of this size. The chapter on 'Intellectual Reality in Religious Teaching and Learning' is one of the soundest in the book. We heartily commend it.

J.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MODE OF THE INCARNATION.

Sir,—Where agreement is beyond reach it is well that disagreement should not be needlessly widened. This letter aims at showing how divergent views of the virgin birth become less seriously divergent if common misapprehension be removed and the scriptures be better understood. The historical evidence will not be here weighed, nor some other aspects considered ; the single question dealt with is whether the belief expressed in the creeds and based on the scriptures is rightly apprehended.

Begin with the prologue of St. John. 'The Word became flesh and dwelt among us.' It is not recorded *how* ; but the sentence is a sequel to the opening, 'In the beginning was the Word,' and the sentences which follow this. In them no one can fail to see sustained reminiscences of the creation record in *Genesis*. The aim plainly is to set forth the fact of a new creation. There is a parallel between the original creation of light, of

**Christian Education in the Church*, by P. T. Thomson, M.A. (S.C.M. 1/-.)
**The Scripture Lesson in the Elementary School*, by Helen Wodehouse, D.Phil. (S.C.M. 3/- and 2/-.)

life, of man, and the second creation of Light coming into the world, o Life in Him, of a new race 'begotten not of blood, nor of the will of th flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' These 'become children of God believing in His Name.' There is nothing here in conflict with a virgi birth, but neither is there anything to support it: the point is that th whole emphasis is upon the new beginning in the Word become flesh bein the counterpart of the original creation of God, and the new race of God' children answering to the first making of man in His likeness. That is th standpoint from which the whole is regarded.

Now this is precisely the standpoint of St. Paul. He often recurs to th idea of Christ as a new Adam, the founder of a new race; and he present the facts as a new creation. 'The first man Adam became a living soul the last Adam became a life-giving spirit' (*I Cor.* 15, 45; cf. 21-22; *Rom* 5, 12-19). 'If any man is in Christ there is a new creation' (*II Cor.* 5, 17) The 'new man,' or the 'newness of life' which is his in virtue of this nev beginning, is repeatedly mentioned; sometimes less explicitly connecte with the original creation, yet always with implicit connection of thought e.g. *Col.* 3, 9-15; *Eph.* 2, 15; 4, 24. Nothing is ever said by St. Paul as t *how* this creation on a higher plane was effected, for Christ, or for men save that the latter are those who are 'in Christ.' There is neithe emphasis on, nor even mention of, the virgin birth, but only on the paralle between the new beginning in Christ and the old beginning of all things both acts of the Creator.

Turn next to St. Matthew. The title of his Gospel at once strikes th same keynote: 'The Book of the Genesis of Jesus Christ.' Here is th counterpart of the Book of Genesis, so called because opening with th record of creation in the beginning. If it be said that the title is not a original part of the Gospel, the reply is conclusive: it is derived from th Gospel, and shows that the force of its language was appreciated when th title was added. For the pedigree which forms the prelude is made up o links constituting a chain, each with ἐγέννησεν as its central word, an finally ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς. Then the very phrase of the title occurs in the open ing of the story: 'Now the Genesis of Jesus Christ was on this wise (1, 18). The correspondence with the Book of Genesis is marked at once In the story itself the virgin birth is twice affirmed, in 1, 18 and 25, whic give the negative aspect. The positive aspect is also twice affirmed, bot times with a reference to creative life whose source is God the Creator. I both cases the decisive words are said of Mary, 'She was found with chil ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου . . .: That which is generated (γεννηθὲν) is ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου (1, 18, 20). What is here said or suggested? To read the words πνεύμ ἁγίου in a Trinitarian sense is a plain and gross anachronism. To add th merely popular mistake of supposing that the Holy Spirit supplied in som sense the place of the husband in an ordinary birth involves heresy besides the Holy Spirit 'proceeds from the Son,' but there is no warrant for affirm ing that the Son proceeds from the Spirit; he is 'the Son of the Father. These are quite certainly wrong ways to read the words. What then is th right way? We have here a further reference to the creation story o Genesis. When all was dark and formless 'God's spirit moved upon th face of the waters, and God said: Let there be light.' And in the accoun of the succeeding chapter God 'formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' Both in *Genesis* and i the Gospel πνεύμα is in all these cases without the definite article, and i quite impersonal. In the large majority of the instances in which the wor

occurs in the New Testament (though not in all) πνεύμα is impersonal, and very commonly its meaning is better given in English by 'inspiration' than by 'spirit.' There are indeed comparatively few instances in which the word does not retain some of the force which its passive form implies, a 'breath' *given,* a *result* of the act of breathing or inspiring. In *Genesis* the meaning is that the Creator breathed upon the waters of chaos, and on the dust of the ground, and so bestowed His own life, which called into existence a new world and a man. Similarly in the Gospel the assertion is that the child of Mary was the result of Divine inspiration: life was bestowed, and its source was the Author and Giver of life, God the Creator.

On turning to St. Luke this conclusion is confirmed. In I, 31 the annunciation tells nothing of how the great event shall come about: 'Thou shalt conceive . . . and bring forth a son. He shall be great, and shall be called a son of the Most High.' There is no justification for rendering υἱὸς 'the son,' much less 'the Son,' in the second clause any more than in the first. All that is asserted is that Mary's son shall be God's son, and therefore 'great.' This is carried somewhat further in reply to her question 'How shall this be since I know not a husband?' Again it is the parallel to the original creation story that is drawn; but for this to be clear the words used must not be distorted by intruding the definite article where it is not found, or printing terms used impersonally with capital letters. The angel's reply is, 'Holy inspiration shall come upon thee, and a power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also what is generated shall be called holy, a son of God.' The breath of God, the might of God, these are the sources of life and creation; and even as these 'moved' over the waters of primeval darkness, and entered into dust of the ground, when the world and man were made, so shall they overshadow the woman who takes the place of the 'dust' in this new creation. The new Adam to be born can be described as nothing else than 'a son of God,' just as the first Adam is so called by St. Luke himself in 3, 35. All the emphasis is thrown on the wonder of a Divine origin due to an act of creative power. There is complete reticence as to *how*; and 'the handmaid of the Lord' sinks willingly into insignificance in the presence of this new creation by the Living God. In corroboration of this it should be noted that in the immediate sequel St. Luke uses the same expression πνεύμα ἅγιον twice or thrice in precisely the same way, quite impersonally. First Elizabeth (1, 41), then Zacharias (1, 67), are said to be 'filled with holy inspiration' (ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου) and to give utterance to a psalm of thanksgiving under its impulse, and then the same thing is said of Simeon (2, 15) with the like result. With this the Lukan phrase in Acts 2, 4, should be compared, where the sense is the same. In all three cases what is meant by πνεύμα ἅγιον is the compelling power of creative life which is in God, and which when brought to bear on a human agent made originally in His likeness gives birth now to inspired 'tongues,' now to inspired poetry, now to an inspired child 'with the glory of an only-begotten from a Father, full of grace and truth' (*Joh.* 1, 14). The natural human portrait sketched by St. Luke in 2, 39-52, is in complete accord with this reading of his narrative of the nativity.

Now it has already been said that the scope of this letter does not extend to any discussion of the historical facts which lie behind the Gospel stories, nor of the literary facts which have gone to their formation; the Gospels are here taken at their full face value. May it not be truly said that when they are read open-eyed, and without any bias given by later

views and controversies, the virgin birth presents far less ground for divergencies, and practically none for dogmatic super-structure? There is no 'higher' doctrine of our Lord than that of St. Paul and St. John, and no securer basis for the Incarnation than is afforded in the belief they held; yet they neither emphasise nor even affirm incidentally the virgin birth. In the two Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke this is distinctly affirmed, but in neither is it stressed; all the weight is thrown on the power of God shown in the new creation of a new humanity inaugurated in His Son, the first fruits of the old creation's hope to be delivered from the bondage of its corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (*I Cor.* 15, 25; Rom. 8, 21). So He was called 'Jesus,' as the Saviour of His people—the new race—from their sins, bringing many sons to glory by revealing the way of suffering as the way of life (*Mat.* 1, 21; *Heb.* 2, 10).

Who needs more than this faith? To ask *How?* is natural enough, though not necessary; and if the question be raised, then the answer which the scriptures give is not to direct the enquiring mind to the virgin birth, but to concentrate it on a new inspiration corresponding to that which in the beginning gave life to the world and to man. Such inspiration is a gift out of the fulness of God's own life, bestowed with the compelling power of creation. The Creator alone has life in Himself, and gives it to His Son, to His sons (*Joh.* 5, 24, 26). For the manifestation in history 'born of woman' is required, even as 'suffered under Pontius Pilate' is also, but both are incidental; the mother in the new creation takes the place of the 'dust of the ground' in the old record, neither being stressed in the least. God remains central and all-sufficient in both, and His inspiration is the sole cause of life. So 'when the fulfilment of the time came God sent forth His Son, generated from woman, generated under law, that He might redeem those under law, that we might recover* the status of sonship. And because ye are sons God sent the inspiration of His Son into your hearts crying Abba! Our Father!' (*Gal.* 4, 4). There is the Christian faith in all its fulness, and with all its hope. Whatever views we may hold about the virgin birth we all agree in this: may we not likewise agree in its sufficiency?

E. P. Boys-Smith.

Hordle Vicarage, Hants.
December, 1926.

[*Although St. Augustine took the Greek in this sense, Lightfoot suggests 'receive *as destined for, as promised to us.*' While it is correct to say that the Fourth Gospel and the Epistle to the Hebrews stress in the case of our Lord the Whence and not the How, it is difficult not to feel that St. Luke, if our present text be correct, has stressed the How, although he has not stressed it as much as St. Matthew has done.—Ed., M.C.]

SOUTH AFRICAN MISSION PROBLEMS.

Sir,—On my return from a visit to Northern Rhodesia I am greeted by a 'World Call'; but it seems to me possible that a change of method may be even more urgently needed than money. In South Africa, including the two Rhodesias, there is unstinted praise of the hospitality of the Missions and of the work of Medical Missionaries. There is widespread acknowledgment that where anything has been done for the good of the natives it

has generally been done by the Missions, but there is also a very widespread doubt whether the harm done by the Missions does not out-balance the good. The following are among the alleged failings of Missions :—

Some do not seem to realize that Christians are a Body : they ignore their white neighbours, and do not invite their advice and fellowship.

Some Missionaries begin to teach before they have learnt the language and the native point of view.

Some Missions bribe boys to come and be taught. They seem to aim at quantity rather than quality.

Neighbouring Missions give very different impressions of the Christian religion ; the natives are puzzled, and budding faith is chilled.

The tree must be judged by its fruit. The Mission boy is on the average inferior in character to the raw savage. He has lost the restraint of the kraal, without anything to take its place. He is lazier, less truthful, honest and trustworthy, while 'cockiness' takes the place of native good manners ; in fact, he is a hypocrite with a religious veneer.

The Colonial mind is distinctly critical about Missions, though everyone allows that there is a small leaven of real and saintly Christians among their converts.

One hears certain Missions frequently singled out for praise—most frequently perhaps the White Fathers. Their success is attributed to these grounds :—

The Fathers are not self-chosen, but 'sent' because of their fitness for the work.

They have all (like many other missionaries) devoted themselves to a life of the utmost simplicity and self-denial, and are under strict discipline.

They require regular work from their 'boys,' and teach them useful handicrafts.

What Protestants consider the fetishisms of the Roman Church are a natural sequel to the magic of the witch-doctor, and have a special appeal.

In Northern Rhodesia I was among Ba-Ila—a very backward tribe, whose immorality is only slightly tempered by tabu ; so much so that it seems likely as a tribe to die out, of its own viciousness. Here it seems hopeless to get hold of even the children unless moved from the vileness of the kraal. Among their customs is that of 'throwing away' babies, if born in an unusual way, or with a tooth cut ; if they cut a top tooth first ; those born to girls who have not been through the initiation ceremony ; twins, etc. There seems no objection to other people rearing such children, who are still 'thrown away' surreptitiously, in spite of British rule. And it does seem that the one hope of the race is to get hold of these children, and bring them up to form a Christian kraal, under missionary guidance.

In trying to put myself in the other man's place, it seemed that the spiritual food provided should be 'milk for babes'—the simple teaching of Jesus without the accretion of doctrines that have been drawn up to confute the verbal and intellectual heresies of past generations. The detailed history of the Jews, and the gradual revelations they received, together with the greater part of St. Paul's arguments, should be left until some future time, when the native mind has been educated to digest them. It would mani-

festly be courting disaster to give the savage the examples of Jael and Jehu in doing God service, or of David and Solomon in the ordering of their lives; while the simplest and most beautiful of our creeds would to them be an inculcation of tri-theism. Could not the Protestant Churches make a beginning of reunion, by drawing up a joint syllabus of instruction and a Book of Prayer and Praise suited to the comprehension of the backward heathen? Personally I believe that any good man living among natives like a Christian will have an immense, if unconscious, influence upon their outlook and characters. I should be slow to blame those who have faced difficulties which I have never coped with, but it seems pretty plain from all the evidence that the Church militant in South Africa has most splendid men, but that its staff-work is deplorable.

C.B.R.

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH, SCIENCE, AND RELIGION.

SIR,—An author who feels himself mis-represented by a reviewer can only protest on grounds of fact, but on such grounds he has a right to be heard.

Will you, then, kindly permit me to say (1) that I am not 'a proselyte used to win over erring brethren,' but a student of the facts since 1889; (2) that I nowhere state that 'essential Christianity centres round survival.' Essential Christianity is contained in the Sermon on the Mount, in the Fourth Gospel, and in *I Cor.* xiii. I attach the same importance to survival as did St. Paul, neither more nor less. (3) I do not 'attack' Modernism—I only show some facts which Modernism would do well to take into account; and (4) the price of the book is not 76/-, but 7/6. This misprint, doubtless unintentional, gives a totally false idea of the scope of the book.

STANLEY DE BRATH
(Editor of *Psychic Science*).

[We regret the printer's error, for which we were to blame.—ED., M.C.]

MISS NUSSEY'S RESIGNATION.

SIR,—Members of the Modern Churchmen's Conference will learn with regret of the resignation of our Conference Secretary, which took effect from November last. Miss Nussey has been the untiring Secretary of the Conferences since their inception in June, 1914. Well-wishers of our cause, who value the annual Modern Churchmen's Conferences, desire to make a presentation to Miss Nussey, as a small token of their gratitude to her. Those who wish to contribute may send subscriptions to me before March 1st. No subscription should exceed 5/-.

ALICE M. ASHLEY (MISS).

3 St. Stephen's Road, Canterbury.

CORRIGENDA.

In the last issue of the *Modern Churchman*, p. 500, the volumes of *Diatessarica* should be 13, not 18.

A neat, pleasant, inexpensive edition of Dr. Edwin Abbott's *Philochristus* was issued by Macmillans in 1916. We were unaware that it had been reprinted since its publication in 1878.—ED., M.C.